

942.07 S78h

Stanhope, Philip Henry St 010101 000

History of England from the Pe



0 2074 0108278 0


DAVIDSON COLLEGE LIBRARY

**EX LIBRIS  
COLLEGII DAVIDSONIENSIS**



**THE FAY ROSS DWELLE  
LIBRARY MEMORIAL FUND**

Library of  
Davidson College



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025



**HISTORY**  
**OF**  
**E N G L A N D.**

**LORD MAHON**

**[Philip Henry Stanhope, 5th Earl Stanhope]**

**VOL. I**

**AMS PRESS**  
**NEW YORK**

942.07

578L

V.1

77-10902

# HISTORY OF ENGLAND

FROM

THE PEACE OF UTRECHT

TO

THE PEACE OF VERSAILLES.

1713—1783.

BY LORD MAHON.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

1713—1720.

FIFTH EDITION, REVISED.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1858.

**Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**

**Stanhope, Philip Henry Stanhope, 5th Earl, 1805-1875.**

**History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the  
Peace of Versailles, 1713-1783.**

Reprint of the 1858 ed. published by J. Murray, London.

Includes index.

CONTENTS: v. 1. 1713-1720. v. 2. 1720-1740. v. 3.  
1740-1748. etc.

1. Great Britain—History—18th century. I. Title.

DA480.S78 1975 942.07 79-176010

ISBN 0-404-06240-7

Reprinted from the edition of 1858, London

First AMS edition published in 1975

Manufactured in the United States of America

International Standard Book Number:

Complete Set: 0-404-06240-7

Volume 1: 0-404-06241-5

AMS PRESS INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE FIRST VOLUME.

---

### CHAPTER I.

| A. D. |  | Page       |
|-------|--|------------|
| 1713. | Introduction - - - - -                         | 1          |
|       | The Peace of Utrecht - - - - -                 | 5          |
|       | State of Parties - - - - -                     | 6          |
|       | Whigs and Tories - - - - -                     | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Remnant of the Republican party - - - - -      | 7          |
|       | The Jacobites - - - - -                        | 8          |
|       | Retrospect on the Revolution of 1688 - - - - - | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Act of Settlement in 1701 - - - - -            | 10         |
|       | Increase of the Jacobite party - - - - -       | 14         |
|       | Views of the Duke of Marlborough - - - - -     | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Established Church - - - - -               | 16         |
|       | The Roman Catholics - - - - -                  | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Dissenters - - - - -                       | 17         |
|       | Manners of the English gentry - - - - -        | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Population - - - - -                           | 18         |
|       | Revenue - - - - -                              | 19         |
|       | High amount of salaries - - - - -              | 20         |
|       | Character of Queen Anne - - - - -              | 22         |
|       | The Lord Treasurer Oxford - - - - -            | 23         |
|       | Lord Bolingbroke Secretary of State - - - - -  | 25         |

### CHAPTER II.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Chances of the Royal Succession - - - - - | 31         |
| Intrigues of Lord Oxford - - - - -        | <i>ib.</i> |
| Of Lord Bolingbroke - - - - -             | 33         |
| Divisions in the Cabinet - - - - -        | <i>ib.</i> |



| A. D. |  | Page       |
|-------|--|------------|
| 1713. | Meeting of Parliament - - - -                          | 34         |
|       | The Treaty of Commerce with France - - -               | 35         |
|       | Attacks of the Opposition - - - -                      | 36         |
|       | Mutual animosity - - - -                               | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Addresses to remove the Pretender from Lorraine -      | 37         |
|       | Motion for a Repeal of the Union with Scotland -       | 38         |
|       | Sermons of Dr. Sacheverell - - - -                     | 40         |
|       | Public Thanksgiving for the Peace - - -                | 41         |
|       | Parliament prorogued - - - -                           | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | And dissolved - - - -                                  | 42         |
|       | Despondency of the Whigs - - - -                       | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | New Elections - - - -                                  | 43         |
|       | Digression on the state of both Houses in this reign - | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | On the House of Lords - - - -                          | 44         |
|       | On the House of Commons - - - -                        | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Advantage of the smaller boroughs - - -                | 45         |
|       | Scarcely any reports of the debates - - -              | 46         |
|       | Nor lists of the divisions - - - -                     | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Their place supplied by party pamphlets - -            | 48         |
|       | Character of Swift - - - -                             | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Violent measures of Bolingbroke against the press -    | 50         |
|       | Concurred in by the House of Commons - -               | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Jacobite intrigues during the autumn - - -             | 52         |
|       | New appointments at Court - - - -                      | 53         |
|       | New-modelling the army - - - -                         | 54         |
|       | The Pretender is urged to renounce his religion -      | 55         |
|       | His refusal - - - -                                    | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The friends of the Protestant Succession - -           | 56         |
|       | Active measures of General Stanhope - - -              | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Supineness of the Court of Hanover - - -               | 57         |
|       | Declining health of the Queen - - - -                  | 58         |
|       | Swift and the Duchess of Somerset - - -                | 59         |

## CHAPTER III.

|       |  |            |
|-------|--|------------|
| 1714. | Ferment in Scotland - - - -                          | 61         |
|       | And in Ireland - - - -                               | 63         |
|       | The Duke of Shrewsbury Lord-Lieutenant - -           | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The new Parliament of England meets - - -            | 64         |
|       | Attack upon Swift in the Lords - - - -               | 65         |
|       | And upon Steele in the Commons - - - -               | 66         |
|       | Speech of Robert Walpole - - - -                     | 67         |
|       | And of Lord Finch - - - -                            | 68         |
|       | Case of the Catalans - - - -                         | 69         |
|       | Address in their behalf from the Lords - -           | 71         |
|       | Votes on the security of the Protestant Succession - | 72         |
|       | And against the Pretender - - - -                    | 74         |

| A. D. |  | Page         |
|-------|--|--------------|
| 1714. | The Envoy from Hanover demands the Prince's writ       | - 75         |
|       | Perplexity of Ministers - - - -                        | - 76         |
|       | Resentment of the Queen - - - -                        | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Change of policy in the Whig party - - - -             | - 77         |
|       | Lord Clarendon sent ambassador to Hanover - - - -      | - 79         |
|       | Death of the Princess Sophia - - - -                   | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Schism Act - - - -                                 | - 80         |
|       | Speech of Stanhope - - - -                             | - 81         |
|       | Lord Oxford's ambiguous conduct - - - -                | - 82         |
|       | Machinations of the Jacobites - - - -                  | - 84         |
|       | A proclamation issued against the Pretender - - - -    | - 85         |
|       | Divided state of the Ministry - - - -                  | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Open quarrel between Bolingbroke and Oxford - - - -    | - 86         |
|       | Lady Masham takes the part of the former - - - -       | - 87         |
|       | The latter is dismissed by the Queen - - - -           | - 88         |
|       | Project of the new Administration - - - -              | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Duke of Marlborough returns to England - - - -     | - 89         |
|       | The Queen's dangerous illness - - - -                  | - 90         |
|       | The Dukes of Somerset and Argyle appear in the Council | 91           |
|       | Shrewsbury recommended as Lord Treasurer - - - -       | - 92         |
|       | And appointed by the Queen - - - -                     | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Measures to secure the Protestant Succession - - - -   | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Queen dies - - - -                                 | - 93         |

## CHAPTER IV.

|       |   |              |
|-------|---|--------------|
|       | Project of Atterbury - - - -                        | - 94         |
|       | The Lords Justices nominated - - - -                | - 95         |
|       | Marlborough arrives in London - - - -               | - 96         |
|       | Parliament meets - - - -                            | - 97         |
|       | Recognition of the new Government by Foreign Powers | 98           |
|       | Character of George the First - - - -               | - 99         |
|       | He leaves Hanover - - - -                           | - 101        |
|       | Arrives in England - - - -                          | - 102        |
|       | New Administration - - - -                          | - 103        |
|       | The two Secretaries of State - - - -                | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Lord Townshend - - - -                              | - 105        |
|       | General Stanhope - - - -                            | - 106        |
|       | Anecdotes on his appointment - - - -                | - 111        |
|       | Leadership of the House of Commons - - - -          | - 112        |
|       | The Coronation - - - -                              | - 114        |
|       | Proceedings of the Pretender - - - -                | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Embassy of Stanhope to Vienna - - - -               | - 115        |
| 1715. | His return - - - -                                  | - 117        |
|       | Dissolution of Parliament - - - -                   | - <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The new one meets - - - -                           | - 118        |
|       | Debate on the Address - - - -                       | - 119        |

| A. D. |   | Page       |
|-------|---|------------|
| 1715. | Intended prosecution of the late Ministers -    | 119        |
|       | Bolingbroke escapes to France -                 | 121        |
|       | The Committee of Secrecy -                      | 122        |
|       | Examination of Prior -                          | 123        |
|       | Report of the Committee -                       | 124        |
|       | Bolingbroke, Oxford, and Ormond are impeached - | 125        |
|       | Flight of Ormond -                              | 127        |
|       | Oxford is committed to the Tower -              | 129        |
|       | Impolicy of these acts of vengeance -           | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Disturbances in the country -                   | 132        |
|       | The Riot Act passed -                           | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Death of the Marquis of Wharton -               | 133        |
|       | And of Lord Halifax -                           | <i>ib.</i> |

## CHAPTER V.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Plans of the Jacobites abroad -                            | 135        |
| Lord Bolingbroke at Paris -                                | <i>ib.</i> |
| He becomes Secretary of State to the Pretender -           | 136        |
| His negotiations with the French Court -                   | 137        |
| Arrival of the Duke of Ormond -                            | 139        |
| Death of Louis the Fourteenth -                            | 140        |
| Altered views of the Government of France -                | 141        |
| Communications with England -                              | <i>ib.</i> |
| Ineffectual attempts of Ormond -                           | 144        |
| Lord Mar -   | 145        |
| He leaves London -   | <i>ib.</i> |
| And raises an insurrection in the Highlands -              | 146        |
| His force increases -                                      | 147        |
| Plan to surprise Edinburgh Castle -                        | 148        |
| It fails -   | 150        |
| Difficulties of the English Government -                   | <i>ib.</i> |
| Duke of Argyle appointed to command in Scotland -          | 151        |
| And Lord Sutherland sent to the extreme north -            | 152        |
| Mar enters Perth -   | 154        |
| His want of military skill -                               | 155        |
| Movements of the English Jacobites -                       | 156        |
| Arrest of six Members of Parliament -                      | 157        |
| Tranquillity preserved in the western counties -           | 158        |
| And at Oxford -  | <i>ib.</i> |
| Insurrection in Northumberland -                           | 159        |
| Mr. Forster chosen as its leader -                         | 160        |
| Insurrection in the south of Scotland under Lord Kenmure - | 161        |
| Forster and Kenmure join their forces -                    | <i>ib.</i> |
| Expedition of Brigadier MacIntosh -                        | 162        |
| His attempt upon Edinburgh -                               | <i>ib.</i> |
| Defended by the Duke of Argyle -                           | 163        |

| A. D. |   | Page       |
|-------|---|------------|
| 1715. | MacIntosh retreats - - - -                    | 164        |
|       | His junction with Forster and Kenmure - - - - | 166        |
|       | Their march along the Border - - - -          | 167        |
|       | They enter Lancashire - - - -                 | 168        |
|       | Attacked by the King's troops - - - -         | 169        |
|       | Their surrender at Preston - - - -            | 172        |
|       | Proceedings in Scotland - - - -               | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Mar advances against Argyle - - - -           | 173        |
|       | Battle of Sheriffmuir - - - -                 | 174        |
|       | Mar makes a retreat - - - -                   | 176        |
|       | Loss of both armies - - - -                   | 177        |

## CHAPTER VI.

|       |   |            |
|-------|---|------------|
|       | Negotiations of Lord Mar - - - -                            | 179        |
|       | James lands at Peterhead - - - -                            | 181        |
| 1716. | He proceeds to Scone Palace - - - -                         | 182        |
|       | Bad state of his affairs - - - -                            | 183        |
|       | His character and conduct - - - -                           | 184        |
|       | The Duke of Argyle sets his army in motion - - - -          | 186        |
|       | The insurgents retreat from Perth - - - -                   | 187        |
|       | The Pretender and Lord Mar re-embark - - - -                | 189        |
|       | Dispersion of the insurgent army - - - -                    | 190        |
|       | The Pretender at St. Germain's - - - -                      | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Advice of Lord Bolingbroke - - - -                          | 191        |
|       | Dismissal of that Minister - - - -                          | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | His vindication - - - -                                     | 192        |
|       | Trials of the prisoners in England - - - -                  | 193        |
|       | Seven Peers sent to the Tower - - - -                       | 194        |
|       | Address from the House of Lords - - - -                     | 195        |
|       | Lord Nottingham dismissed from office - - - -               | 196        |
|       | Execution of Lord Derwentwater - - - -                      | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | And of Lord Kenmure - - - -                                 | 197        |
|       | Trial of Lord Wintoun - - - -                               | 198        |
|       | Remarks on these proceedings - - - -                        | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Bill to strengthen the Protestant interest - - - -          | 200        |
|       | The Septennial Act - - - -                                  | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | It passes the House of Lords - - - -                        | 204        |
|       | Petitions against it - - - -                                | 205        |
|       | It passes the Commons - - - -                               | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Opinion of Lord Somers upon it - - - -                      | 206        |
|       | His death and character - - - -                             | 207        |
|       | The King determines to visit Germany - - - -                | 210        |
|       | Repeal of the restraining clause - - - -                    | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Prince of Wales appointed guardian of the realm - - - - | 211        |
|       | The King's departure - - - -                                | <i>ib.</i> |

| A. D. |   | Page       |
|-------|---|------------|
| 1716. | His want of popularity at this period - - - | 212        |
|       | The Duchess of Kendal - - -                 | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | The Countess of Darlington - - -            | 213        |

## CHAPTER VII.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Views of foreign policy - - -                                  | 214        |
| Difficulties of a treaty with the Emperor - - -                | 215        |
| The Duke of Orleans Regent in France - - -                     | 216        |
| His new political system - - -                                 | 217        |
| Question of Mardyke - - -                                      | 218        |
| The Abbé Dubois - - -  | 219        |
| He meets Stanhope at the Hague - - -                           | 221        |
| The Regent sends him to Hanover - - -                          | <i>ib.</i> |
| Preliminaries signed at that place - - -                       | 223        |
| State of Northern affairs - - -                                | 224        |
| Treaty with Denmark against Sweden - - -                       | 225        |
| Ambitious designs of the Czar - - -                            | 226        |
| He attempts to obtain a footing in Germany - - -               | <i>ib.</i> |
| Project to seize his person - - -                              | <i>ib.</i> |
| Opposition of the Ministers in England - - -                   | 227        |
| Peaceful adjustment of that question - - -                     | 228        |
| Difficulties respecting the French treaty - - -                | 229        |
| Violence of Horace Walpole - - -                               | 231        |
| Suspensions against Lord Townshend - - -                       | 232        |
| Justification of his conduct - - -                             | 233        |
| Other grounds of dissatisfaction - - -                         | 234        |
| The Earl of Sunderland - - -                                   | 236        |
| His journey to Hanover - - -                                   | 239        |
| Angry correspondence - - -                                     | 240        |
| Horace Walpole proceeds to Hanover - - -                       | 242        |
| Fresh causes of complaint - - -                                | 243        |
| Cabals of the Prince of Wales - - -                            | 244        |
| Lord Townshend is dismissed from his office of Secretary - - - | 246        |
| But offered the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland - - -              | 247        |
| Charge of treachery against Stanhope - - -                     | 248        |
| His defence - - -  | 250        |

## CHAPTER VIII.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Ministerial schism - - -                | 252        |
| Letters of Townshend and Walpole - - -  | 253        |
| 1717. The King returns to England - - - | 255        |
| The Ministers are reconciled - - -      | <i>ib.</i> |
| Negotiation at the Hague - - -          | 256        |



| A. D. |   | Page       |
|-------|---|------------|
| 717.  | Conclusion of the Triple Alliance - -             | 256        |
|       | The King of Sweden intrigues with the Jacobites - | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Projects of invasion - - - -                      | 257        |
|       | Arrest of Count Gyllenborg - - - -                | 259        |
|       | And of Baron Gortz - - - -                        | 260        |
|       | The Parliament meet - - - -                       | 261        |
|       | Renewed Ministerial schism - - - -                | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Dismissal of Lord Townshend - - - -               | 262        |
|       | Resignation of Robert Walpole and others - -      | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Conduct of Walpole in Opposition - -              | 263        |
|       | His early life - - - -                            | 264        |
|       | His character - - - -                             | 267        |
|       | Financial measures of Walpole and Stanhope -      | 273        |
|       | Angry altercation between them - -                | 274        |
|       | Lord Cadogan accused of peculation - -            | 275        |
|       | But acquitted - - - -                             | 276        |
|       | Trial of Lord Oxford - - - -                      | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Cabals of Walpole and others in his favour -      | 277        |
|       | His impeachment is dropped - - - -                | 279        |
|       | His letter to the Pretender - - - -               | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Act of Grace - - - -                              | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Stanhope raised to the Peerage - - - -            | 280        |
|       | State of Spain - - - -                            | 281        |
|       | Power and policy of Cardinal Alberoni - -         | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | His causes of complaint with the Emperor -        | 284        |
|       | He determines on war - - - -                      | 285        |
|       | Armament at Barcelona - - - -                     | 286        |
|       | Conquest of Sardinia - - - -                      | 287        |
|       | France and England interpose - - - -              | 288        |
|       | Difficulties at the Court of Vienna - -           | 289        |
|       | Another armament prepared by Alberoni - -         | 291        |
|       | His intrigues with the disaffected in France -    | 292        |
|       | And in England - - - -                            | 293        |

CHAPTER IX.

|       |   |            |
|-------|---|------------|
|       | Breach in the Royal Family - - - -                    | 294        |
|       | Parliament meets - - - -                              | <i>ib.</i> |
| 1718. | Scarcity of silver - - - -                            | 295        |
|       | An English fleet sent to the Mediterranean -          | 298        |
|       | Exchange of offices between Stanhope and Sunderland - | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Retirement of Addison - - - -                         | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | And of Lord Cowper - - - -                            | 299        |
|       | Death and character of the Duke of Shrewsbury -       | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Last meeting of the Convocation - - - -               | 302        |
|       | Negotiations at Madrid - - - -                        | 303        |
|       | A new Spanish armament - - - -                        | 304        |

| A. D. |  | Page       |
|-------|--|------------|
| 1718. | Stanhope undertakes a mission to Paris - - -                     | 305        |
|       | Conclusion of the Quadruple Alliance - - -                       | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Stanhope proceeds to Madrid - - -                                | 306        |
|       | Sailing of the Spanish armament - - -                            | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Their troops land in Sicily - - -                                | 307        |
|       | Views of Alberoni - - -  | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Negotiations of Stanhope at the Escorial - - -                   | 309        |
|       | His return to England - - -                                      | 310        |
|       | State of Spain at this juncture - - -                            | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Progress of the Spaniards in Sicily - - -                        | 312        |
|       | Admiral Byng and the English fleet at Naples - - -               | 313        |
|       | They sail through the Faro - - -                                 | 314        |
|       | Naval action off Cape Passaro - - -                              | 315        |
|       | Destruction of the Spanish fleet - - -                           | 316        |
|       | Fury of Alberoni at these tidings - - -                          | 317        |
|       | His projects baffled in Holland - - -                            | 318        |
|       | And at Turin - - -   | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Plan of alliance between Russia and Sweden - - -                 | 319        |
|       | Charles the Twelfth is killed - - -                              | 320        |
|       | Total change in Northern affairs - - -                           | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Projects of Alberoni in France - - -                             | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Conspiracy of the Duke and Duchess du Maine - - -                | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Is discovered by the Government - - -                            | 322        |
|       | The Duke and Duchess arrested - - -                              | 323        |
|       | Declaration of war from France and England against Spain - - -   | 324        |
|       | Session of Parliament - - -                                      | 325        |
|       | Design of Stanhope for the relief of Protestant Dissenters - - - | 326        |
|       | And of Roman Catholics - - -                                     | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | He proposes the Repeal of the Schism Act - - -                   | 327        |
| 1719. | Opposition of Walpole - - -                                      | 329        |
|       | The Bill is carried - - -  | <i>ib.</i> |
|       | Journey of the King to Hanover - - -                             | 330        |

# CHAPTER X.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Alberoni's preparations for an invasion of England - - -    | 331        |
| The Pretender arrives in Spain - - -                        | 332        |
| Sailing of the expedition - - -                             | 333        |
| It is scattered by a storm - - -                            | 334        |
| Two frigates reach Scotland - - -                           | 335        |
| Lords Marischal, Tullibardine, and Seaforth disembark - - - | <i>ib.</i> |
| Action at Glenshiel - - -                                   | 336        |
| Surrender of the Spaniards - - -                            | <i>ib.</i> |
| Escape of the Scottish chiefs - - -                         | <i>ib.</i> |
| And of Princess Sobieski - - -                              | 338        |
| Campaign on the Pyrenean frontier - - -                     | 339        |
| The French take St. Sebastian - - -                         | 341        |

| A. D.    |  | Page         |
|----------|--|--------------|
| 1719.    | The English storm Vigo - - -                                       | - 342        |
|          | State of affairs in Sicily - - -                                   | - 343        |
|          | The Austrian reinforcements arrive - - -                           | - 344        |
|          | Battle of Franca Villa - - -                                       | - <i>ib.</i> |
|          | Alberoni attempts to obtain a favourable peace - - -               | - 345        |
|          | Determination of France and England to enforce his dismissal - - - | - 346        |
|          | Cabals at Madrid - - -   | - 347        |
|          | The Earl of Peterborough - - -                                     | - 348        |
|          | His negotiations against Alberoni - - -                            | - 350        |
|          | Disgrace of that Minister - - -                                    | - 351        |
|          | He is banished from Spain - - -                                    | - <i>ib.</i> |
|          | Conclusion of Peace - - -  | - 352        |
|          | Affairs of the North - - -   | - <i>ib.</i> |
|          | Return of King George from Hanover - - -                           | - 354        |
|          | Meeting of Parliament - - -  | - <i>ib.</i> |
|          | The Peerage Bill - - -   | - <i>ib.</i> |
|          | Motives of that measure - - -                                      | - 355        |
|          | Pamphlets for and against it - - -                                 | - 357        |
|          | True object and origin of the Peerage - - -                        | - 359        |
|          | Opposition of Walpole to the Bill - - -                            | - 362        |
|          | His eloquent speech - - -  | - 365        |
|          | The Bill is rejected by the House of Commons - - -                 | - <i>ib.</i> |
| APPENDIX | - - - - -  | i—xlvii      |



## INTRODUCTION.

---

THE era of the Georges in England may be compared to the era of the Antonines at Rome. It was a period combining happiness and glory—a period of kind rulers and a prosperous people. While improvement was advancing at home with gigantic strides, while great wars were waged abroad, the domestic repose and enjoyment of the nation were scarce for a moment ever broken through. The current was strong and rapid, but the surface remained smooth and unruffled. Lives were seldom lost, either by popular breaches of the law or by its rigorous execution. The population augmented fast, but wealth augmented faster still: comforts became more largely diffused, and knowledge more generally cultivated. Unlike the era of the Antonines, this prosperity did not depend “on the character of a single man.”\* Its foundations were laid on ancient and free institutions, which, good from the first, were still gradually improving, and which alone, amongst all others since the origin of civil society, have completely solved the great problem how to combine the greatest security to property with the greatest freedom of action.

It is true, however, that this golden period by no means affords us unmingled cause for self-congratulation, and contains no small alloy of human frailties and of human passions. Some of the quiet I have mentioned may be imputed to corruption, as much as some of the troubles to faction. Our pride as legislators may sink when we

\* See the remarks of Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. iii. vol. i. p. 127. ed. 1820.



discover that our constitutional pre-eminence has arisen still more from happy accident than from skilful design. We may likewise blush to think that even those years which, on looking back, are universally admitted as most prosperous, and those actions now considered irreproachable, were not free at the time from most loud and angry complaints. How ungratefully have we murmured against Providence at the very moment when most enjoying its bounty! How much has prosperity been felt, but how little acknowledged! How sure a road to popularity has it always been to tell us, that we are the most wretched and ill-used people upon the face of the earth! To such an extent, in fact, have these outcries proceeded, that a very acute observer has founded a new theory upon them; and, far from viewing them as evidence of suffering, considers them as one of the proofs and tokens of good government.\*

In attempting to unfold, at least for a small period, this mingled mass of national wisdom and national folly, — of unparalleled prosperity and of stunning complaints, — I venture to promise the reader, on my part, honesty of purpose. I feel that unjustly to lower the fame of a political adversary, or unjustly to raise the fame of an ancestor — to state any fact without sufficient authority, or to draw any character without thorough conviction, implies not merely literary failure, but moral guilt. Of any such unfair intention I hope the reader may acquit me — I am sure I can acquit myself.

The published works which I shall quote I need not enumerate. The MSS. which I have consulted for this volume are the following :— The Stanhope Papers, at Chevening; the Stuart Papers, which were transmitted to the late King from Rome, and to which I obtained access by the gracious indulgence of his present Majesty; the very im-

\* “ J’ai toujours trouvé que le meilleur gouvernement est celui contre lequel on crie le plus fort sur les lieux mêmes; et il suffit de citer l’Angleterre et les Etats Unis d’Amérique; car cela prouve que l’on a l’œil sur ceux qui dirigent les affaires, et qu’on peut impunément censurer leurs mesures.” (Simond, *Voyage d’Italie*, tom. ii. p. 286.) A still more celebrated Genevese, M. de Sismondi, makes a similar observation in his recent essay, *Sur l’Elément Aristocratique*.

portant collection of the Earl of Hardwicke, which he has laid open to me in the most liberal and friendly manner ; the collections (mostly copies) of Archdeacon Coxe, which were presented by his brother to the British Museum ; and the Memoirs of the Master of Sinclair, with notes by Sir Walter Scott, which I owe to the kindness of J. G. Lockhart, Esq.

*January, 1836.*



THE  
HISTORY OF ENGLAND  
FROM  
THE PEACE OF UTRECHT.

---

CHAPTER I.

THE administration of Marlborough and Godolphin, in the reign of Queen Anne, shines forth with peculiar lustre in our annals. No preceding one, perhaps, had ever comprised so many great men or achieved so many great actions. Besides its two eminent chiefs, it could boast of the mild yet lofty wisdom of Somers, the matured intellect of Halifax, and the rising abilities of Walpole. At another time, also, the most subtle statesman and the most accomplished speaker of their age, Harley and St. John, were numbered in its ranks. It had struck down the overgrown power of France. It had saved Germany, and conquered Flanders. "But at length," says Bishop Fleetwood, with admirable eloquence, "God for our sins permitted the spirit of discord to go forth, and, by troubling sore the camp, the city, and the country (and oh that it had altogether spared the place sacred to his worship!) to spoil for a time this beautiful and pleasing prospect, and give us in its stead — I know not what. Our enemies will tell the rest with pleasure." To our enemies, indeed, I would willingly leave the task of recording the disgraceful transactions of that period. Let them relate the bedchamber influence of Mrs. Masham

with her sovereign, and the treacherous cabals of Harley against his colleagues — by what unworthy means the great administration of Godolphin was sapped and overthrown — how his successors surrendered the public interests to serve their own — how subserviency to France became our leading principle of policy — how the Dutch were forsaken and the Catalans betrayed — until at length this career of wickedness and weakness received its consummation in the shameful peace of Utrecht. It used to be observed, several centuries ago, that as the English always had the better of the French in battles, so the French always had the better of the English in treaties.\* But here it was a sin against light; not the ignorance which is deluded, but the falsehood which deludes. We may, perhaps, admit that it might be expedient to depart from the strict letter of the Grand Alliance — to consent to some dismemberment of the Spanish monarchy — to purchase the resignation of Philip, or allow an equivalent for the Elector of Bavaria by the cession of Sicily and Sardinia, or, perhaps, of Naples. So many hands had grasped at the royal mantle of Spain, that it could scarcely be otherwise than rent in the struggle. But how can the friends of Bolingbroke and Oxford possibly explain or excuse that they should offer far better terms at Utrecht in 1712, than the French had been willing to accept at Gertruydenberg in 1709? Or if the dismissal of the Duke of Marlborough had so far raised the spirits of our enemies and impaired the chances of the war, how is that dismissal itself to be defended?

It is at the conclusion of this unworthy treaty in March, 1713, and not till then, that I have fixed the commencement of my narrative.

At that period the two great contending parties were distinguished, as at present, by the nicknames of Whig and Tory. But it is very remarkable that, in Queen Anne's

\* “*Jamais ne se mena traité entre les François et Anglois que le sens des François et leur habileté ne se monstret pardessus celle des Anglois, et ont lesdits Anglois un mot commun qu'autrefois m'ont dit traitant avec eux; c'est qu'aux batailles qu'ils ont eues avec les François toujours, ou le plus souvent, ils ont eu le gain; mais en tous traitez qu'ils ont eu à conduire avec eux, ils y ont eu perte et dommage.*” (Mém. de Comines, liv. iii. ch. viii.)



reign, the relative meaning of these terms was not only different, but opposite to that which they bore at the accession of William the Fourth. In theory, indeed, the main principle of each continues the same. The leading principle of the Tories is the dread of popular licentiousness. The leading principle of the Whigs is the dread of Royal encroachment. It may thence, perhaps, be deduced that good and wise men would attach themselves either to the Whig or to the Tory party, according as there seemed to be the greater danger at that particular period from despotism or from democracy. The same person who would have been a Whig in 1712, would have been a Tory in 1830. For, on examination, it will be found that, in nearly all particulars, a modern Tory resembles a Whig of Queen Anne's reign, and a Tory of Queen Anne's reign a modern Whig.\*

It is, therefore, a certain and a very curious fact, that the representative at this time of any great Whig family, who probably imagines that he is treading in the footsteps of his forefathers, in reality, while adhering to their party name, is acting against almost every one of their party principles.

I am far, however, from wishing to impute this change as an inconsistency, or want of principle, in either Whigs or Tories. The current of party often carries men very far, and almost imperceptibly, from the point where they first embarked; and what we scarcely blame even in individuals, we cannot, of course, condemn in successive generations. And in all the variations the name is commonly the last thing that is changed: a remark which Paley makes of religion †, and which is equally true in politics.

Besides these two great party divisions, there was also, in the reign of Anne, a handful of Republicans and a large body of Jacobites. The former generally screened themselves under the name of Whigs, as the latter under the name of Tories. But the former, comprising at that time only a few of the more violent Dissenters, and a remnant of the Roundheads, possessed hardly any influence, and

\* Some instances and illustrations of this remarkable counter-change will be found in the Appendix to this volume, *ad fin.*

† Moral Philosophy, book v. ch. x.

deserves but little detail. Nay, even amongst that small party which was taunted as Republican, by far the greater number are not to be understood as positive enemies of the Throne. They wished both the monarchy and peerage to subsist, though with diminished authority. It is true, that the term of Republican Party was perpetually in the mouth of the Tories and the courtiers. But this, which at first sight might make us believe in its strength, is, in fact, only another proof of its weakness; since the idea of a Republic was so generally hateful to the nation as to afford a useful byword for crimination. "It may "be confidently asserted," says Mr. Hallam, of the reign of William, "that no Republican party had any existence, "if by that word we are to understand a set of men whose "object was the abolition of our limited monarchy. . . . "I believe it would be difficult to name five persons to "whom even a speculative preference of a Commonwealth "may, with great probability, be ascribed."\* It is surely no small proof how severely the people had suffered under the old Commonwealth, to find that, with all the misconduct of the succeeding reigns, that Commonwealth had left no roots nor offsets behind it.

The Jacobites, on the other hand, were at this time a most numerous and powerful party. To explain their principles and conduct will require a short historical retrospect.

The Revolution of 1688 is an event of which the English have long been justly proud. While James the Second continued a constitutional monarch, they continued a loyal people. They were neither rebellious under just authority, nor submissive under despotic encroachments. They took up arms neither too late nor too soon. If their conduct be compared with that of any other people, under similar circumstances, it may well be doubted whether any ever so completely and so admirably fulfilled their conflicting duties as subjects and as freemen.

On deposing and banishing James the Second, the proclamation of his infant son as King, with the Prince of Orange, or one of the Princesses as Regent, would un-

\* Constitutional Hist. vol. iii. p. 164. 3d ed.

doubtedly, in my opinion, have been the natural and proper course. But the doubts entertained at that time of the Prince of Wales's legitimacy — his removal into an enemy's country — the probability of his education as a Roman Catholic — the firm determination of William to decline a temporary trust — and the necessity of making England, in his hands, an active member of the Confederacy for maintaining the Liberties of Europe — all these prevented a compromise else so just and salutary. The result was, a vast extension of party feuds, sixty years of national division, and three civil wars. The party of the Jacobites, which would otherwise have been utterly insignificant, and soon have ceased to exist at all, grew into a large and formidable power; and the discussion turned no longer, as it should have done, on the personal guilt of James, but on the inherent right of his son.

It is also very remarkable, that even over those minds which had utterly disavowed any such inherent right, the tenet still exercised a latent but considerable influence. Compare the style of the leading statesmen of the day in addressing James the Second and his successor. Even in the worst actions of James, we find even the Opposition using more respectful and deferential language towards him than William, in the fulness of power, often received from his own official servants.\* They entertained, unconsciously, a sort of feeling that the Prince of Orange was not their rightful ruler. And how much stronger must that feeling have been amidst the multitude, which is so much less capable of appreciating arguments or drawing distinctions — which respects laws or institutions from their antiquity so much more than from their wisdom! How should this feeling warn the nations never lightly, nor without full provocation, to cast off the sway of their rulers! How does it show that, in many cases, a bad King with a good title may be happier for the state than a good King with a bad title!

Thus the Revolution, though undoubtedly a great and glorious event, was nevertheless attended with no small

\* See especially the letters to the King of Admiral Russell in the Shrewsbury Correspondence, and those of Lord Sunderland in the Hardwicke Papers. Nothing can be more blunt and insolent.

concomitant evils. Still, however, there was the prospect that the succession would be preserved in the line of Charles the First. But the death of Queen Mary in 1694, and of the Duke of Gloucester in 1700, having blighted these hopes, it became necessary for Parliament to provide for the succession. In 1701 was accordingly passed the celebrated Act of Settlement, excluding not only the son of James the Second (then known by the name of the Pretender), but the next Catholic heirs; and entailing the Crown upon Sophia, Electress Dowager of Hanover, a daughter of the Queen of Bohemia, and a granddaughter of King James the First. This was followed up, in 1702, by another Act for abjuring the Pretender, to which William gave the Royal Assent only a few hours before he expired;—a legacy worthy that great man.

On an impartial consideration, the measures of 1701 and 1702 may be considered to deserve unmixed praise. For, however desirable the project of a Regency might have been at first, it seems certain that any subsequent attempt to bring in the Pretender could not have been accomplished without ruin to both our civil and religious liberties. The Pretender being therefore excluded, who then should be chosen? With so strong a Protestant feeling as then happily prevailed in England, it would have been little short of madness to select a Catholic sovereign. No other alternative then remained, to combine hereditary right as much as possible with constitutional freedom, but to appoint the nearest Protestant heir. There was, no doubt, serious evil in selecting a sovereign who, like George the First, was a German in birth and in habits, and a stranger to the manners, to the laws, and even to the language, of the people he was called upon to govern. There was evil in selecting the ruler of a small independent state; and there was reason to fear that the interests of the Electorate might be sometimes unduly preferred to those of England. But how light and transient do not these evils appear, when compared to those of priest-craft and slavery, which they averted! With what reverence ought not the promoters of the Hanover Succession, during the reign of Anne, to be remembered by every patriotic friend of freedom—by

every duteous son of the Church! And how much has their wisdom been shown forth, not merely by contemporary arguments, but by subsequent results — by the long period of happiness and honour which this country, through the blessing of Providence, has enjoyed under the present reigning family!

A part of this happiness and honour should, no doubt, also be ascribed to the cautious limitations which accompanied the Act of Settlement. It was provided — 1. That whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this Crown shall join in communion with the Church of England, as by law established. 2. That in case the Crown and imperial dignity of this realm shall hereafter come to any person, not being a native of this kingdom of England, this nation be not obliged to engage in any war for the defence of any dominions or territories which do not belong to the Crown of England, without the consent of Parliament. 3. That no person who shall hereafter come to the possession of this Crown shall go out of the dominions of England, Scotland, or Ireland, without consent of Parliament. 4. That from and after the time that the further limitation by this act shall take effect, all matters and things relating to the well-governing of this kingdom, which are properly cognisable in the Privy Council by the laws and customs of this realm, shall be transacted there; and all resolutions taken thereupon shall be signed by such of the Privy Council as shall take, advise, and consent to the same. 5. That after the said limitation shall take effect as aforesaid, no person born out of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland, or the dominions thereunto belonging (although he be naturalised or made a denizen, except such as are born of English parents), shall be capable to be of the Privy Council, or a member of either house of Parliament; or to enjoy any office or place of trust, either civil or military; or to have any grant of lands, tenements, or hereditaments, from the Crown to himself, or to any other or others in trust for him. — 6. That no person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons. — 7. That after the said limitation shall take effect as aforesaid, Judges' com-



missions be made *QUAMDIU SE BENE GESSERINT*, and their salaries ascertained and established; but upon the Address of both Houses of Parliament it may be lawful to remove them. — 8. That no pardon under the Great Seal of England be pleadable to an impeachment by the Commons in Parliament.

The first of these articles was a safeguard of our national religion, as the second of our national independence. The want of some such restraint as the fifth had been felt very strongly in the case of William and his foreign favourites, his Portlands and his Albemarles; and its enactment proved most salutary during the reigns of the first two Georges. Great advantages would in like manner have been derived from the third article, had it not, as I shall afterwards have occasion to show, been too readily repealed on the accession of George the First. The sixth article, on the other hand, was hasty and ill-considered. There can be no doubt that, in the reign of William, as in the two preceding, the number of placemen in the House of Commons was dangerously and unconstitutionally large; nor can it be denied that a fearful degree of corruption and venality had grown out of that abuse.\* But to extirpate that abuse by its opposite — by the total and unconditional exclusion of all members of the Government — seems scarcely less absurd than a physician who should advise a glutton to touch no food at all. To pronounce the favour of the Crown to be of course incompatible with the confidence of the people, appears dangerous in theory. To determine that no Minister of State should bring forward and explain his measures to Parliament, would be ruinous in practice. So evident, indeed, were these and other such considerations, that, in 1706, after an interval of cool reflection, the article was repealed. But two provisions of great importance were established in its stead. First, that every member of the House of Commons accepting an office under the Crown, except a higher commission in the army, shall vacate his seat, and a new writ shall issue. Secondly, that no person, holding an office created since the 25th of October, 1705, shall be capable of being

\* See, for instance, *Parl. Hist.* vol. v. pp. 886. 911, &c.

elected at all.\* These restrictions continued unchanged, and even unquestioned, during the reigns of the four Georges. It may be observed, however, that the vacating of seats by Members who take office might often have been productive of most serious injury, had it not in a great measure been neutralized by the effect of the smaller boroughs. For until our new constitution of Parliament in 1832, any eminent statesman, though he might be out-voted at one place, was perfectly sure of his election at another. The defeat of a great party leader, under any circumstances, such as that of Mr. Brougham in Westmoreland, or of Sir Robert Peel at Oxford, was speedily repaired at Winchelsea or Westbury.

The Act of Settlement, in favour of the House of Hanover, was, however, attended with one great but unavoidable evil—a large increase of the Jacobite party. Many of the Tories had been willing to concur in the exclusion of James the Second and his son, so long as the throne was held by other members of his family, but were most reluctant to admit so wide a departure from the hereditary line as the establishment of the House of Hanover. There was, also, a very general wish to see still upon the throne some descendant of Charles the First, a monarch whose memory had become hallowed in the minds of the people from the crime of their fathers against him, and from his consecration as the “Royal Martyr” by the Church. Under the influence of these feelings, a very considerable number of the landed gentry, and of the High Churchmen, began to cast a wistful look of expectation towards St. Germain’s. “Several in England,” writes a Jacobite agent in 1711, “wish the King well, who would not hazard their estates for him . . . . . If he came with ten thousand men it is thought there would not be a sword drawn against him. . . . . There are, besides, a set of men well dis-

\* See the excellent remarks of Mr. Hallam (Const. Hist. vol. iii. p. 257. 8vo. ed.). I would, however, presume to doubt whether that eminent writer be not mistaken when he says, that “at the same time were excluded all such as held pensions during the pleasure of the Crown.” That clause seems to have been rejected in 1706, since ten years afterwards a Bill for that very object was brought in by General Stanhope. See the Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 374.



“posed, who have taken the oaths to the Government only by form, and whom General Stanhope, in Sacheverell’s trial, called the Non-juror Swearers. These are very numerous in the two kingdoms.”\*

Besides these — besides the steady old Jacobites — besides the whole body of the Roman Catholics, the Court of St. Germain’s also received promises of support from several leading Ministerial statesmen. The extent of this infidelity, which has more recently come to light from the publication of original papers, is truly appalling. No feeling of attachment to party, nor of admiration for greatness, should make us shrink from exposing the shameful treachery of men who secretly kept up a treasonable correspondence with seals of office in their hands, and professions of loyalty on their lips. Amongst these, since 1688, had been Admiral Russell, Lord Danby, the Duke of Shrewsbury, the Lord Treasurer Godolphin, and, above all — it is with shame and sorrow that I write it — the Duke of Marlborough. His conduct to the Stuarts is, indeed, a foul blot on his illustrious name. He had from early life been attached to James the Second. He had received high favours from that monarch. Yet he quitted that monarch at the very hour when fortune was turning upon him, and under all the circumstances that could add a sting to perfidy. I do not deny that a sense of patriotism, and a conviction of the dangers to which both religion and liberty were exposed under the government of James, would justify his conduct, and that he might be praised for remembering, with a truly Roman spirit, his duty to his country before his obligations to his patron. But, as Hume well observes, this defence requires that we should find on his part ever after the most upright, disinterested, and public-spirited behaviour. How difficult, then, does it become to excuse his defection when we find him, almost immediately after its success, taking measures to provide for a change of circumstances — to stand well with the dethroned Court, should it be restored — to have to plead the most ardent vows of repentance and attachment! How difficult when we find him betraying to the enemy

\* Macpherson’s Original Papers, vol. ii. p. 212, &c. ed. 1775.

the secret expedition against Brest — when we find that expedition consequently failing — and costing the lives of eight hundred British soldiers!\* What defence can possibly be offered for such conduct! No other than that of Manlius when he pointed to the Capitol!

To the last, Marlborough persevered in these deplorable intrigues. To the last he professed unbounded devotion to the Courts both of Hanover and of St. Germain. Thus, for example, in April, 1713, he writes to the Elector: "I entreat you to be persuaded that I shall be always ready to hazard my fortune and my life for your service." In October of the same year we find him solemnly protesting to a Jacobite agent, that he had rather have his hands cut off than do anything prejudicial to King James's cause!† It may be observed, however, that a correspondence with the exiled family during the reign of Anne, though equally dangerous and hurtful to the public interests, was far less treacherous and disgraceful to the parties themselves than during the reign of William. The objects of the Jacobites had changed. Under William they wished to dethrone and expel the reigning monarch. Under Anne, on the contrary, their views were, in England at least, directed to the hope of her succession. When any of her Ministers, therefore, concurred in these views, they, at least, did not concur in any personal injury or insult to the sovereign whom they served. Nay, these views were more than suspected to be in accordance with Her Majesty's secret predilections.

It is to be observed, before I quit the subject of parties, that the Tories at this period were the more numerous,

\* The secret letter of Marlborough to King James is printed by Macpherson, vol. i. p. 485. Coxe (vol. i. p. 76.) endeavours to defend him, by alleging that Marlborough knew that he had sent his intelligence too late to be of any service to the French. But this would only be a further refinement of perfidy. In the *Memoirs* alleged to be written by Fouché, and perhaps compiled in part from his notes, there is the boast of a similar course with respect to the plans of Napoleon, before the battle of Waterloo. See vol. ii. p. 342. ed. 1824.

† See Macpherson's *Original Papers*, vol. ii. pp. 442. and 488. It appears, also, from the *Stuart Papers* at Windsor, that the chief communications with the Duke of Marlborough, towards the close of Anne's reign, were carried on through the means of Mr. Tunstal, under the cant name of "Trevers." Marlborough's cant name was "Malbranche."

and comprised the bulk of the landed proprietors and parochial clergy. The Whigs, on the other hand, had in their favour nearly the whole monied interest.

The great majority of the English at this period firmly held the doctrines of the Established Church, and zealously supported its privileges. "The Church for ever!" had become a favourite cry. During Sacheverell's trial the sedan chair of the Queen used to be surrounded by an anxious crowd exclaiming, "God bless your Majesty and the Church! We hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell!" Another proof of this salutary attachment may be drawn from the fact, that both the Tories and Whigs were accustomed to charge each other—as a ground of unpopularity—with endangering the Church; the Tories because they favoured the Roman Catholics; and the Whigs because they favoured the Dissenters. The state of each of these sects may, perhaps, require a few words of detail.

The Roman Catholics at this time seemed very inconsiderable as to numbers. In Ireland, indeed, or at least in its southern and western provinces, they comprised the mass of the labouring classes; but these at that time were men of most unruly temper and abject ignorance, and befriended by no party in the state. Swift was a Tory of that era; yet, in all the eighteen volumes of his works, it would not be easy to point out a single sentence of sympathy or interest with this portion of his fellow-countrymen. So far from it, that in some passages he is anxious to represent the Irish Protestants as English settled in Ireland, and to draw a strong line of distinction between them and the native Irish.\* In England, on the other hand, the Roman Catholics could boast of many adherents amongst the ancient peerage and gentry and other educated classes, but had hardly any hold upon the lower. In spite of their very small numbers, they were the objects of extreme alarm to the Protestants, from the remembrance of their former persecutions, and from the religious tenets and impending return of the Pretender. The most unfounded imputations against

\* See, for instance, a letter to Pope so late as July 23. 1737. "We are grieved to find you made no distinction between the English gentry of this kingdom and the savage old Irish."

them were always greedily received. No charge was too gross, no falsehood too glaring, for the credulous animosity of the public. In fact, it is very remarkable how frequently the multitude arrives at a right conclusion from false premises; and it might be truly asserted, that such old wives' fables as the burning of London by the Roman Catholics have produced more effect against them than even the noble martyrdom of Ridley or the unanswerable arguments of Chillingworth. Very rigorous enactments had been passed against the Catholics in the reign of Queen Anne. But in practice these were for the most part moderately and mildly administered; and we find Bolingbroke asserting, in 1714, that the Catholics "enjoy "as much tranquillity as any others of the Queen's subjects."\*

Of the Protestant Dissenters, who at this period, before the rise of Methodism, were not numerous, I shall have a better opportunity of saying a few words when I come to the repeal of the Schism Act.

The manners of the English gentry, in this age, were, in a great measure, purely national; and, except, at Court, had received from foreign nations neither polish nor corruption. To travel had not yet grown to be a very common practice. It was not yet thought that a visit to more genial climes, or more lovely landscapes, was the best preparation for afterwards living happy and contented in our own. In fact, according to the old English maxims, no one could go abroad without special permission from the sovereign. Thus, in the reign of Elizabeth, Sir William Evers was severely punished because he had presumed to make a private journey to Scotland.† In the first part of the eighteenth century, the same authority seems still to have existed, at least with respect to the great nobility. The Duke of Shrewsbury, for example, could not go abroad, in 1700, until he had obtained leave from King William.‡ Thus, also, the Duke of Marlborough's application for a passport, in 1712, was op-

\* Letter to Mr. Prior, Jan. 30. 1714. Corresp. vol. ii.

† See a letter from James the First, interceding for Evers, in Birch's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 511.

‡ Shrewsbury Corresp. p. 630.

posed by several members of the Cabinet.\* The fees for a passport at the Foreign Office amounted to upwards of 6*l.*†, a sum far from inconsiderable in those days, and serving as a check upon the lower class of travellers. To travel with passports from the Foreign Ministers resident in England is a later, and, in my opinion, a mischievous and unwarrantable innovation.

Thus amongst the gentry and middle classes of Queen Anne's time, the French language was much undervalued, and seldom studied. At Court, however, the case was very different; and, though few could speak French very accurately, it is remarkable how much the style of many eminent men at this period, in their private correspondence, teems with Gallicisms. The letters of Marlborough, especially, appear written by a Frenchman. Thus, for example, he uses the word "opiniatrety" for obstinacy, and "to defend" instead of to forbid.‡

At the peace of Utrecht, the population of England was not much above five millions.§ It may be doubted whether that of Scotland exceeded one million||, or that of Ireland, two; although I need hardly observe how far less accurately and carefully such calculations were made in those days. It is certain, however, that the rural in-

\* Coxe's Life, vol. vi. p. 221.

† Bolingbroke's Corresp. vol. ii. p. 82., note to a letter from Prior, of Sept. 1712. When I was Under Secretary of State in that department (in 1835), I found the fees on each passport reduced to 2*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

‡ See Coxe's Life, vol. iv. pp. 229. 243, &c. The duty on the importation of unbound foreign books into England from June, 1711, to June, 1712, amounted only to 120*l.* 15*s.*, and in the ensuing year to 192*l.* 3*s.* (Commons' Journals, vol. xvii. p. 605.) That duty which had been doubled in 1711, appears to have been 60 per cent. *ad valorem*. (Ibid. p. 642.)

§ See the Preface to the 1st. vol. of the Population Returns, 1831, p. 45. According to the calculations of Mr. Finlaison, the population of England and Wales in 1710 was 5,066,000, and in 1700, 5,134,000, thus showing a decrease of 68,000 in ten years. It is remarkable that all the periods of ten years between 1710 and 1830, when the population had grown to 13,800,000, exhibit, on the contrary, a steady and progressive increase. Will the wars of Queen Anne's reign account for the difference? But then, what shall we say to the wars of the French Revolution?

|| Yet Fletcher of Saltoun estimated the number of gipsies in Scotland at not less than 200,000! A monstrous exaggeration!



habitants of England then very far outnumbered those in the towns; but the latter having since increased in much greater proportion, more especially in the manufacturing districts, the two classes have come nearly to an equality\*; a change which has, I fear, involved within it the germ of other changes.

The national debt, at the accession of Anne, had been only 16,000,000*l.*, with an interest of 1,300,000*l.* In 1714, it had grown to 52,000,000*l.*, with an interest of 3,300,000*l.*† By the accounts presented to Parliament in that year, it appeared that the expense of the late war during twelve years, amounted to nearly 69,000,000*l.*, making a yearly average of above five millions and a half.‡ The debts, during this period, seem to have been contracted on very moderate terms. Lord Treasurer Godolphin observes, in one of his letters, in 1706: "Though the land and trade both of England and Holland have excessive burthens upon them, yet the credit continues good, both with us and with them; and we can, either of us, borrow money at four or five per cent.; whereas, the finances of France are so much more exhausted, that they are forced to give 20 and 25 per cent. for every penny of money they send out of the kingdom, unless they send it in specie."§ In 1709, the supplies voted exceeded seven millions, a sum that was unparalleled, and seemed enormous.|| In fact, though these sums at present may appear light in our eyes, they struck the subjects of Anne with the utmost astonishment and horror. "Fifty millions of debt, and six millions of taxes!" exclaims Swift: "the High Allies have been the ruin of us!" Bolingbroke points out, with dismay, that the public revenue, in neat money, amounted, at the Revolution, to no more than two millions annually; and the public debts, that of the bankers included, to little more than three hundred thousand pounds. Speaking of a later period, and of a debt of thirty millions, he calls it "a sum that will

\* See Colquhoun's *Wealth and Resources*, p. 23.

† *Ibid.* p. 265.

‡ *Parliamentary History*, vol. vi. p. 1346.

§ Letter to the Duke of Marlborough, dated Sept. 24. 1706, and printed in the 3d volume of Coxe's *Life*.

|| *Somerville's Queen Anne*, p. 334.

"appear incredible to future generations, and is so almost "to the present!" It is, I hope, with no undue partiality, that I venture to remark, how much juster and more correct on this point were the views of Secretary Stanhope. In the minutes of a conference which he held in 1716, with Abbé Dubois, I find the following remark recorded of him:—"However large our national debt may be "thought, it will undoubtedly increase much more, and "believe me, it will not hereafter cause greater diffi- "culty to the government, or uneasiness to the people, "than it does at present."\*

But, though we might astonish our great-grandfathers at the high amount of our public income, they may astonish us at the high amount of their public salaries. The service of the country was then a service of vast emolument. In the first place, the holder of almost every great office was entitled to plate; secondly, the rate of salaries, even when nominally no larger than at present, was, in fact, two or three times more considerable from the intermediate depreciation of money. But even nominally, many offices were then of higher value, and when two or more were conferred upon the same person, he, contrary to the present practice, received the profits of all. As the most remarkable instance of this fact, I may mention the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. Exclusive of Blenheim, of Parliamentary grants, of gifts, of marriage portions from the Queen to their daughters, it appears that the fixed yearly income of the Duke, at the height of his favour, was no less than 54,825*l.*, and the Duchess had, in offices and pensions, an additional sum of 9,500*†*—a sum, I

\* See the *Mémoires de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 207.

† A statement of the offices and emoluments enjoyed by the Duke of Marlborough:—

|  | Per annum. |
|--|------------|
| Plenipotentiary to the States - -                                      | - £7,000   |
| General for the English forces on Mr. How's estab-<br>lishment - - - - | - 5,000    |
| General in Flanders, upon Mr. Brydges' establish-<br>ment - - - -      | - 5,000    |
| Master of the Ordnance - - - -   | - 3,000    |
| Travelling charges as Master of the Ordnance -                         | - 1,825    |
| Colonel of the Foot Guards, being twenty-four<br>companies - - - -     | - 2,000    |



need hardly add, infinitely greater than could now be awarded to the highest favour or the most eminent achievements. There can be no doubt that the former scale was unduly high: but it may be questioned whether we are not at present running into another as dangerous extreme; whether by diminishing so much the emoluments of public service, we are not deterring men with genius, but without fortune, from entering the career of politics, and forcing them rather to betake themselves to some lucrative profession; whether the greatest abilities may not thereby be diverted from the public service; whether we are not tending to the principle that no man, without a large private property, is fit to be a Minister of State; whether we may not, therefore, subject ourselves to the worst of all aristocracies, an aristocracy of money; whether we may not practically lose one of the proudest boasts of the British Constitution under which great talent, however penniless or lowborn, not only may raise, but frequently has raised, itself above the loftiest of our Montagus or Howards.

In Queen Anne's time the diplomatic salaries were regulated according to a scale established in 1669. Am-

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Pension - - - - -   | 5,000   |
| From the States of Holland, as General of their Forces - - - - -      | 10,000  |
| From the foreign troops in English pay, six-pence per pound - - - - - | 15,000  |
| For keeping a table - - - - -   | 1,000   |
|   | <hr/>   |
|   | £54,825 |

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Offices, &c. of the Duchess.                 |        |
| Keeper of the Great and Home parks - - - - - | £1,500 |
| Mistress of the Robes - - - - -              | 1,500  |
| Privy purse - - - - -                        | 1,500  |
| Groom of the Stole - - - - -                 | 3,000  |
| Pension out of the Privy Purse - - - - -     | 2,000  |
|  | <hr/>  |
|  | £9,500 |

(From Somerville, p. 260.) — Lord Dartmouth, probably with party exaggeration, says, "Her Grace and the Duke together had above "90,000*l.* a year salary." Note to Burnet's Hist. vol. vi. p. 33. ed. 1833.

bassadors-ordinary in France, Spain, and the Emperor's Court, had 100*l.* a day, and 1500*l.* for equipage; in Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and the other Courts, 10*l.* a day and 1000*l.* for equipage. Ambassadors-extraordinary had every where the same allowances as the Ambassadors-ordinary, and differed only in the equipage money, which was to be determined by the Sovereign according to the occasion.\* Considering the difference in the value of money, such posts also were undoubtedly more lucrative and advantageous than at present. But, on the other hand, these salaries — and sometimes even those of the civil government at home — were very irregularly paid, and often in arrear. "I neither have received, nor expect to receive," says Bolingbroke, in one of his letters †, "any thing on account of the journey which I took last year by Her Majesty's order (into France); and, as to my regular appointments, I do assure your Lordship I have heard nothing of them these two years."

Ministerial or Parliamentary corruption — at least so far as foreign Powers were concerned — did not in this generation, as in the last, sully the annals of England. Thus, for example, shamefully as the English interests were betrayed at the peace of Utrecht by the English Ministers, there is yet no reason whatever to suspect that they, like the patriots of Charles the Second's reign, had received presents or "gratifications" from Louis the Fourteenth. Should we ascribe this change to the difference of the periods or of the persons? Was the era of the peace of Utrecht really preferable to that of 1679, hailed by Blackstone as the zenith of our constitutional excellence? ‡ Or were Bolingbroke and Oxford more honest statesmen than Littleton and Algernon Sidney?

In reviewing the chief characters which we find at this period on the political stage, that of the Queen need not detain us long. She was a very weak woman, full of prejudices, fond of flattery, always governed blindly by some female favourite, and, as Swift bitterly observes, "had not a stock of amity to serve above one object at a

\* See Bolingbroke's Correspondence, vol. i. p. 114.

† To Lord Strafford, Aug. 7. 1713, vol. ii. p. 466.

‡ Comment. vol. iv. p. 439. ed. by Coleridge, 1825.

“time.”\* Can it be necessary to waste many words upon the mind of a woman who could give as a reason — a lady’s reason! — for dismissing a Cabinet Minister, that he had appeared before her in a tie-wig instead of a full-bottom? † Is it not evident that in such a case we must study the advisers and not the character of a sovereign — that we must look to the setting rather than to the stone?

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, and at this time Lord Treasurer and Prime Minister, is one of the most remarkable examples in history, how it is possible to attain both popularity and power without either genius or virtue. Born in 1661, and bred in Presbyterian principles, which, however, he was not slow in forsaking, he entered Parliament soon after the accession of King William, and was, during four years, Speaker of the House of Commons. On quitting the Chair, in 1704, he was made Secretary of State, through the recommendation of Marlborough. He was, however, an object of suspicion to his other colleagues. “His humour,” says Lord Chancellor Cowper at the time, “is never to deal clearly or openly, but “always with reserve, if not dissimulation, and to love “tricks when not necessary, but from an inward satisfaction in applauding his own cunning.” ‡ He had hitherto, in a great measure, skilfully trimmed between the Tories and the Whigs, and secured a great number of adherents from both. But, almost immediately after his junction with the latter, he began to cabal against them; obtained private interviews with the Queen, through the means of Mrs. Masham; gradually worked himself into Her Majesty’s confidence, and filled her with distrust of her responsible advisers. His letters at that period to Marlborough and Godolphin prove that he knew how

\* Memoirs relating to the Change, Works, vol. iii. p. 227. In his Journal to Stella, he describes Her Majesty’s manner at a drawing-room: — “She looked at us round with her fan in her mouth, and “once a minute said about three words to some that were nearest her, “and then she was told dinner was ready, and went out.” August 8. 1711.

† Scott’s Life of Swift, p. 165.

‡ Private Diary, Jan. 6. 1706. Lord Cowper’s Diary was printed, but not published, by the Roxburgh Club, in 1833, and I have received a copy by the kindness of the Rev. E. C. Hawtrey. It had been seen by Coxe in MS.

to combine the most subtle schemes of malice with the most ardent professions of friendship. His plotting being at length partly brought to light, he was compelled to resign in February, 1708. But he immediately put himself at the head of the Tories; and, retaining his back-stairs influence at Court, and his early friends amongst the Dissenters, he, in little more than two years, undermined and overthrew the great Whig administration. He became chief of that which succeeded, obtained not only the Treasurer's staff, but the Earldom of Oxford, and, next to Mrs. Masham herself, was now the most important subject of the realm. He seems to have possessed in perfection a low sort of management, and all the baser arts of party, which enabled him to cajole and keep together his followers, and to sow divisions amongst his enemies. He spared neither pains nor promises to secure adherents. He affected upon every question a tone of forbearance and candour. But he was one of those inferior spirits who mistake cunning for wisdom. His slender and pliant intellect was well fitted to crawl up to the heights of power through all the crooked mazes and dirty by-paths of intrigue; but having once attained the pinnacle, its smallness and meanness were exposed to all the world. From the moment of his triumph, the expert party leader was turned into the most dilatory and helpless of Ministers. His best friends were reduced to complain that no business could be done with him. "Lord 'Treasurer,'" says Swift, "is the greatest procrastinator 'in the world. He only says, 'Poh! poh! all will be 'well.' He told Mr. Lewis it should be determined to-night, and so he will say a hundred nights."\* Even his taste for literature was numbered amongst his faults; for in him (if I may borrow a phrase from Tillotson) it was only a specious and ingenious sort of idleness. In personal intercourse he was mild, courteous, and concili-

\* Journal to Stella, Nov. 2. 1711; Dec. 19. 1711; and April 15. 1712. Another Tory, Lockhart, says of him:—"He was, indeed, 'very civil to all who addressed him, but he generally either spoke 'so low in their ear, or so mysteriously, that few knew what to make 'of his replies, and it would appear he took a secret pleasure in 'making people hang on, and disappointing them." Comment, p. 370.

atory ; but in public affairs, whenever he could temporise no longer, and was driven to some decision, he had a bias to prerogative and arbitrary measures, as being most easy and convenient to himself.\* With all his indolence in business, he was so jealous of its possession as to claim from his colleagues a larger share of it than even the greatest genius and activity could have satisfactorily transacted. Such was the new Prime Minister of England.

His principal colleague, Henry St. John, was born in 1678. He was an only son by his father's first marriage, the heir to a good estate in Wiltshire, and sprung from a younger branch of the Lords St. John of Bletsoe — one of the most ancient and illustrious houses in the kingdom. His early education was directed by a puritanical mother, whose imprudent zeal compelled him painfully to peruse huge tomes of controversial divinity when far too young to understand their value, and thus, perhaps, implanted in his mind the first seeds of his aversion to the truths of Revelation. "I resolve," he says himself, writing to Swift in 1721, "to make my letter at least as long as one of your sermons; and, if you do not mend, my next shall be as long as one of Dr. Manton's, who taught my youth to yawn, and prepared me to be a High Church-man, that I might never hear him read, nor read him more." It is, in fact, not a little remarkable, that the two great champions of High Church at this time — Oxford and Bolingbroke — should both have been bred up amongst the Dissenters. Manton, whom Bolingbroke thus alludes to, was a non-conforming and most voluminous divine, very worthy, but a little tedious, who, being impressed with some fanciful idea as to the analogy of numbers, wrote 119 sermons upon the 119th Psalm!

Young St. John pursued his studies at Eton and Oxford, and at the dissolution of Parliament, in 1700, was elected Member for Wotton Bassett. He entered public life endowed with every gift of nature, of fortune, and of education, except the most important of all — fixed principle. A handsome person, a strong consti-

\* "Doubtless," says Blackstone, "all arbitrary measures, well executed, are the most *convenient*." Comment. vol. iv. p. 350. ed. 1825. From thence, how often are indolent men the greatest tyrants!



tution, a most engaging, yet most dignified manner, were his external recommendations; and were supported by a rich fund of reading, deep powers of thought, and boundless ambition. He looked through the characters of others with a keen and searching eye. His eloquence, both commanding and rewarding the attention of his hearers, was ready, full, and gushing; according to his own beautiful illustration, it flowed like a stream that is fed by an abundant spring, and did not merely spout forth, like a frothy water, on some gaudy day.\* His genius was vast and lofty, yet able to contract itself at will — scarcely any thing too great for its grasp, and scarcely any thing too minute for its care. With such splendid abilities, such active ambition, he might have been the greatest and most useful statesman of his, or, perhaps, of any age. But he utterly wanted virtue. He was no believer in revealed religion, whose tenets he attempted to sap in his writings, and disregarded in his life. He had early rushed into pleasure with an eagerness and excess that might have been forgiven his youth and his ardent passions, had he not afterwards continued them from a miserable personal vanity. He aimed at being the modern Alcibiades — a man of pleasure at the same time as a man of business; sitting up one night to reel at a drunken orgy, — sitting up the next to compose a despatch on which the fate of Europe might hang; at one hour dealing forth his thunderbolts of eloquence to the awe-struck senate, — at another whispering soft words at the ear of yielding beauty!† In this unworthy combination he lost all dignity of mind. There ceased to be any consistency between his conduct and his language. No man ever spoke more persuasively of the fatigues of business, yet no man was ever more

\* See the letter on the Spirit of Patriotism.

† Voltaire, in one of his letters, relates, or invents, “ce que disait “à ses compagnes la plus fameuse catin de Londres : Mes sœurs, “Bolingbroke est déclaré, aujourd’hui, Secrétaire d’Etat ! Sept mille “guinées de rente, mes sœurs, et tout pour nous !” See a note to Swift’s Works, vol. xvii. p. 291. Lord Bolingbroke’s beautiful lines to one of these ladies, —

“Dear, thoughtless Clara,” &c., —

seem to prove, that had he applied himself to poetry he would have excelled in it.

fretful and uneasy in retirement. For him, activity was as necessary as air for others. When excluded from public life, there were no intrigues, however low and grovelling, to which he did not stoop in order to return to it. Yet all his writings breathe the noblest principles of independence. "Upon the whole of this extraordinary character," says his intimate friend, Lord Chesterfield, "what can we say but, Alas! poor human nature!"

As a writer, Lord Bolingbroke is, I think, far too little admired in the present day. Nor is this surprising. His works naturally fail to please us from the false end which they always have in view, and from the sophistical arguments which they are, therefore, compelled to urge. As a politician, he wished to prove that the peace of Utrecht was honourable; as a philosopher, that the Christian religion was untrue. To one or the other of these points his observations are almost always tending. It is no wonder, therefore, if, from the worthlessness of the materials, we are disposed to undervalue the beauty of the workmanship. But, surely, his style, considered apart from his matter, seems the perfection of eloquence. It displays all the power and richness of the English language; and, in all its changes, never either soars into bombast, or sinks into vulgarity. We may observe with admiration, that, even when defending the cause of tyranny, he knows how to borrow his weapons from the armoury of freedom. The greatest praise of Bolingbroke's style is, however, to be found in the fact, that it was the study and the model of the two greatest minds of the succeeding generation—Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt. The former, as is well known, had so closely imbued himself with it, that his first publication was a most ingenious, and, to many persons, deceptive imitation of its manner. To Mr. Pitt it was recommended by the example and advice of his illustrious father, who, in one of his letters, observes of "Oldcastle's Remarks," that they "should be studied, and almost got by heart, for the inimitable beauty of the style."\* Mr. Pitt, accordingly, early read and often recurred to these political writings; and he has several times stated in con-

\* To Lord Camelford, May 4. 1754. Letters published by Lord Grenville.



versation to the present Lord Stanhope, that there was scarcely any loss in literature which he so deeply deplored, as that no adequate record of Bolingbroke's speeches should remain. What glory to Bolingbroke, if we are to judge of the master by his pupils!

My observations upon Bolingbroke's character have drawn me from my slight sketch of his political career. It remains for me to say, that, having entered the House of Commons in 1700, he almost immediately became one of the most shining and admired speakers of that fastidious assembly. He took the side of the moderate Tories, and more particularly attached himself to Harley. With him he joined the administration of Marlborough and Godolphin, in 1704, and, notwithstanding his youth, was appointed Secretary at War. Marlborough, especially, appears to have taken the warmest interest in the promotion of a rising statesman, whose abilities he discerned, and on whose friendship he relied. "I am very glad," he writes to Godolphin, "that you are so well pleased with Mr. St. John's diligence, and I am very confident he will never deceive you."\* On his part, St. John professed—perhaps he felt at the time—the warmest attachment to his illustrious patron, and addressed him in such terms as the following: "The vast addition of renown which your Grace has acquired, and the wonderful preservation of your life, are subjects upon which I can never express the thousandth part of what I feel. France and faction are the only enemies England has reason to fear, and your Grace will conquer both."† How little was it then foreseen, that the statesman who thus wrote would become the most deadly opponent of the hero—the champion of "France and faction,"—and thus, by his own avowal, the enemy of England!

St. John, in fact, still continued his close connection with Harley. He plunged deep with that crafty leader into the intrigues of Mrs. Masham; with him he also was

\* Letter to Lord Godolphin, July 13. 1704.

† Secretary St. John to the Duke of Marlborough, May 17. 1706. In a previous letter of August 18. 1705, we find him professing to the Duke "the strongest ties of gratitude," and anxiously deprecating "an ill peace, which is certain ruin to us!"

detected, and compelled to resign, in February, 1708. But on this event he immediately joined the Tories, threw into their scale, till then suspended, the whole weight of his ability, and by them was, at no distant period, triumphantly borne back into office. In September, 1710, he was made Secretary of State, with the supreme direction of foreign affairs. For this post he was peculiarly qualified, by not only understanding, but writing, the French language most correctly—an accomplishment which even at present is by no means common, and which at that period was very rare. His task in both conducting and defending the negotiations for peace was extremely arduous. "When I undertook," he says himself, "in opposition to all the Confederates, in opposition to a powerful turbulent faction at home, in opposition even to those habits of thinking which mankind had contracted by the same wrong principle of government, pursued for twenty years, to make a peace, the utmost vigour and resolution became necessary."\* It is on St. John that the shame of the inglorious treaty of Utrecht should mainly rest. He directed all its steps from London; and some fresh difficulties having unexpectedly arisen, he undertook to remove them by a journey to Paris, and a conference with Torcy. At nearly the same time, July 1712, he was raised to the peerage by the title of Viscount Bolingbroke, and on this new political theatre displayed the same talent, and won the same ascendancy as in the House of Commons.

These two statesmen, Oxford and Bolingbroke, were the leading members of the Tory administration. At the head of the Opposition, at this period, were Lords Somers, Cowper, and Halifax, in the House of Peers; General Stanhope and Mr. Robert Walpole in the Commons. One far greater than all—the illustrious Marlborough—was no longer in England. Mortified at the unworthy personal attacks to which he was exposed, and more especially at the base charge of peculation levelled against him under the name of Sir Solomon Medina, he had withdrawn to the Continent in November, 1712, and was re-

\* To Lord Strafford, April 8. 1712. Corresp. vol. i. p. 456.

joined by his Duchess in the following spring. After some wandering, they fixed their residence at Antwerp, where they could carry on a close correspondence with their political friends, and from whence (as was shown by the event) a very short notice might, on any sudden emergency, summon them to England.

## CHAPTER II.

AFTER the conclusion of the peace of Utrecht, the eyes of all England were turned with anxious and undivided attention to the chances of the Royal Succession. That this could be no very distant prospect became evident from the frequent illnesses and declining strength of the Queen. A few months more, it seemed probable, would sever the last remaining link which united the posterity of Charles the First with the throne of England. Warned by Her Majesty's precarious health to look forward, her Ministers were much divided in their wishes; all, indeed, professing alike their attachment to the Hanover Succession, but the greater number of them secret partisans of the Pretender.

The Lord Treasurer, on this as on every other occasion, appears doubtful in his objects and crooked in his means. So early as 1710, he had sent, through Abbé Gaultier, an overture to Marshal Berwick, the Pretender's illegitimate brother, to treat of the restoration of the Stuarts; Anne retaining the Crown for her life, and securities being given for the religion and liberties of England. Peace was, however, he declared, an indispensable preliminary; and he seemed no less anxious that the whole negotiation should be carefully concealed from the Court of St. Germain, of whose usual indiscretion he was probably aware. Berwick, as may well be supposed, raised no objection to these or any other terms; and Oxford promised that next year he would transmit a detailed and specific plan for their common object. No such plan, however, arrived; and, when pressed by the French agents, the Treasurer only descanted on the importance of first securing the army, or returned such answers as "Let us go gently," and "Leave it all to me." As the General Election approached, Oxford became somewhat more explicit, but still gave nothing in writing beyond one insignificant

sentence\*, and no more in conversation than seemed requisite to secure the powerful support of the Jacobites for his administration. The advice he offered was also sometimes of a very questionable nature, as that James should leave Lorraine, and go, for example, to Venice, where he might indeed, as Oxford urged, have more easy intercourse with the travelling English; but where, on the other hand, he would have been very far removed from England, and unable to profit by any sudden conjuncture in his favour. On the whole, Marshal Berwick and the Pretender himself soon became convinced that Oxford's view was chiefly his own present maintenance in power, and that he had no serious intention of assisting them.†

In fact, notwithstanding this negotiation, there are several strong reasons for believing that Oxford was, at heart, no enemy to the Hanover Succession. He had mainly helped to establish that Succession in 1701, and his vanity had, therefore, an interest in its success. It was the safer and the legal side—no small recommendation to a very timid man. His Presbyterian connections—his frequent overtures for a reconciliation with the Whigs—his perpetual disagreements with his more decided Jacobite colleagues—his avowed contempt of the old Stuart policy—might all be pleaded as arguments on the same side. I say nothing of his loud and eager professions of zeal at the Court of Hanover; but, on the whole, I do not doubt that he would readily have promoted the accession of that family, if he could have been assured of their favour afterwards, or if he could have brought them in with small trouble and no hazard to him-

\* "Je parlerai à M. l'Abbé (Gaultier), avant son départ, au sujet "de M. le Chevalier." April, 1713. The secret letters of Gaultier and Iberville to Torcy are not amongst the Stuart Papers, but in the French diplomatic archives. Sir James Mackintosh had access to them in 1814; and some extracts from his collections, by an accomplished literary friend of his and acquaintance of mine, Mr. John Allen, in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. cxxv., have been very useful to me.

† "Il est moralement certain que toutes les avances qu'il nous avait faites n'avaient eu pour motif que son propre intérêt, afin de joindre "les Jacobites aux Torys, et par là se rendre le plus fort dans le "Parlement, et y faire approuver la paix." *Mém. de Berwick*, tom. ii. p. 132. ed. 1778.

self. But indolence and caution were always the main springs of his character; and, perhaps, those of his contemporaries knew him best who believed that he had no fixed designs at all.\*

Bolingbroke, on the contrary, had plunged into the Jacobite intrigues headlong and decisively. Of the usual incitements to Jacobitism — high doctrines of divine right and indefeasible allegiance — he was, indeed, utterly destitute; but he was no less destitute of that zeal for civil rights and the Protestant religion which bound the hearts of his countrymen to the Hanover Succession. Without any prejudice on either side, he looked solely and steadily at his personal interests. He perceived that his Tory connections and his ties with France made him an object of suspicion at Hanover, and left him little to expect from that family upon the Throne. The same reason, however, would render him a favourite with “King James the Third,” especially should that empty title become more substantial through his aid. He, therefore, determined to forward the views of the Jacobites. We find him, at the end of 1712, in secret communication with them†; and during the two following years, he is repeatedly mentioned by the French agents, Gaultier and Iberville, in their private letters, as holding with them most confidential intercourse, and giving them most friendly counsels.

Of the remaining members of the Cabinet, the Jacobites could also reckon on Secretary Bromley‡, and the Dukes of Buckingham and Ormond. Some others, such as Lord Chancellor Harcourt, may be considered as uncertain or wavering; and several, like the Bishop of London, as sincere friends to the Protestant Succession.

It may easily be supposed that an administration thus variously composed could not long remain cordially united. Oxford and Bolingbroke gradually came to be considered

\* See Bolingbroke's Letter to Wyndham, and Cunningham's Hist. vol. ii. p. 303. The latter, however, is, I must admit, very poor authority for any fact or opinion.

† Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 367.

‡ Bromley is mentioned in Iberville's instructions as “un homme attaché presque ouvertement au parti du Roi (Jacques).” Sept. 26. 1713.



as leaders of separate and jarring divisions. The former, as far as professions could go, was indeed most smooth and complying. In his own expression, "If the company "should say Harrow on the Hill or Maidenhead were the "nearest way to Windsor, I would go with them, and "never dispute it, if that would give content, and I might "not be forced to swear it was so."\* But, in practice, Lord Oxford was by no means the easy colleague he describes. All those who knew him bitterly complain of his little jealousies and want of confidence, of the undue share which he claimed in business, of his dilatory manner of transacting it. So early as May 1711, we find Bolingbroke write to Lord Orrery, — "We who are reputed to "be in Mr. Harley's intimacy have few opportunities of "seeing him, and none of talking freely with him. As he "is the only true channel through which the Queen's "pleasure is conveyed to us, there is and must be a perfect stagnation, till he is pleased to open himself, and set "the water flowing." The feuds between the two Ministers were frequently composed, more especially by Swift, their common friend. But as the subject matter of division still remained, it always broke out afresh with aggravated rancour.

Such was the state of parties when Parliament met in April, 1713.

At this period the Ministers were by no means apprehensive of defeat in either House. Of the Upper, Swift writes, on the day before the meeting, "Lord Treasurer "is as easy as a lamb. They are mustering up the "proxies of the absent Lords, but they are not in any fear "of wanting a majority, which death and accidents have "increased this year."† In the Commons their preponderance was even more secure. But that House being then under the operation of the Triennial Act, and in its third and last Session, both parties showed great timidity in all their movements, and were anxious not to commit them-

\* Harley to Lord Godolphin, Sept. 10. 1707. Append. to Somerville, p. 625.

† Journal to Stella, April 8. 1713. Bolingbroke also expected that "the Session will be quiet and short." To Lord Orrery, March 6. 1713.

selves to any measures that might impair their popularity at the ensuing Elections.

On the 9th of May, the following message was presented from her Majesty to the House of Commons:—

“Anne R. As it is the undoubted prerogative of the Crown to make peace and war, I have ratified the treaties of peace and commerce with France, which had been signed by my order, and have concluded a treaty with Spain, which will be signed at Utrecht as soon as the Spanish Ministers are arrived there.”

These treaties were then laid before the House. The stipulations being already well known, and a large majority of the Commons having shown a determination to support them, no debate was attempted on the general question. It would have been but poor generalship to have attacked the whole line with such inferior forces, instead of singling out the weakest points. The Opposition accordingly made a resolute stand on the 8th and 9th articles of the Treaty of Commerce, to which they knew that many of the Ministerial members were disinclined. This 9th article provided that all laws made in Great Britain since 1664, for prohibiting the importation of any goods coming from France should be repealed; and that, within two months, a law should be passed that no higher custom duties should be paid for goods brought from France than were payable for the like goods brought from any other country in Europe. Now the latter clause was a direct violation of the Methuen Treaty, according to which the duties on the Portuguese wines were always to be lower by one third than the duties on the French\*; and this violation would, of course, have lost the English all their trade with Portugal, which was at this time by far the most thriving and advantageous they possessed. Their rising manufactures of silk, of linen, and of paper were, moreover, threatened with unequal competition and probable ruin. The merchants and practical men of business—in that unenlightened age such men were usually preferred to theorists and speculators—with scarcely any exception, viewed this project with dismay; and it has been calculated, on apparently good grounds,

\* See the treaty in the Commons' Journals for 1713, p. 348.



that had the project passed, the annual balance against, or loss to, Great Britain, would have been not less than 1,400,000*L*.\*: so that, on the whole, I think we may fully agree with Bishop Burnet, that "if even we had been "as often beat by the French as they had been beat by "us, this would have been thought a very hard treaty."†

The subject was debated in the House of Commons on the 14th of May, the day appointed to bring in a Bill to make good the 8th and 9th articles of the Treaty of Commerce, when the Opposition put forth all their strength. Mr. Gould, an eminent merchant, Mr. Lechmere, an eminent lawyer, Sir Peter King, and General Stanhope, especially distinguished themselves on that side. They were ably answered by Sir William Wyndham and Mr. Arthur Moore (a person who, by his industry and abilities, had, much to his honour, raised himself from the station of a footman); and, though they were joined by several of the other party, such as Sir George Newland and Mr. Heysham, they were, on the division, outvoted by 252 against 130. Yet Bolingbroke himself admits that "the "treaties met with the coldest reception when they were "laid before the Houses; and those who were frightened "out of their senses, lest they should not be made, affected to appear very indifferent to them when they were "made."‡ On the 9th of June, the House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, and heard several merchants at their bar argue and protest against it. A debate then ensued, remarkable for a singular burst of party feeling. General Stanhope, to confirm the statements of one of the merchants, had quoted in his speech some words from the preamble of an Act passed in Charles the Second's reign. Upon this, the Speaker, supposing Stanhope to be mistaken, rose, and exclaimed, "There is no such thing in "that Act!" The General thereupon desired the Clerk at the table to read the Act in question, when it appeared that his quotation was right, and both he and several other Members then inveighed with much passion on the Speaker's blunder. This little anecdote most strongly shows the mutual animosities and rancour of the times.

\* Macpherson's History of Commerce, vol. iii. p. 31. ed. 1805.

† Burnet's History, vol. ii. p. 620. fol. ed.

‡ To Mr. Prior, July 4. 1713. Corresp. vol. ii. p. 437.

In the House of Commons, any rude interruption from the Speaker, or any harsh invectives against him, are, perhaps, the very furthest extremity to which its party spirit ever runs.

On the following days, some more mercantile petitioners were heard at the Bar against the Bill; and the former speakers on that side renewed and enforced their arguments, thus backed by the testimony of practical men. Through these means, a powerful effect was made upon the Ministerial phalanx. Sir Thomas Hanmer, member for Suffolk, a man of great weight with the House on all occasions, and more peculiarly on this, because in his general politics a Tory, supported the objections of the Whigs; and at last, on the 18th of June, on the question that the Bill should be engrossed, it was decided in the negative by 194 to 185. Thus was warded off one at least of the dangers of the inglorious negotiations at Utrecht.\*

Emboldened by this hard-won victory, the Whig leaders determined to try an address in both Houses, entreating the Queen "to use her most pressing instances for removing the Pretender from the Duke of Lorraine's dominions." This was moved in the Lords by the Earl of Wharton, on the 29th of June, without any previous notice. The Court party were taken completely by surprise. A pause ensued. At last, Lord North rose, and endeavoured to have the motion set aside, observing, that it would show a distrust of her Majesty's intentions. He asked, also, where, after all, they would have the Pretender live; since most, if not all, the powers of Europe were, like the Duke of Lorraine, on terms of friendship with her Majesty. But, no one venturing openly to oppose the motion, it was unanimously carried.

On the 1st of July, General Stanhope brought forward the same motion in the Commons. Here also no opposition was attempted. But Sir William Whitlocke artfully threw out, that he "remembered the like address was formerly made to the Protector for having Charles Stuart

\* According to Bolingbroke, "The reason of the majority was, that "there had been, during two or three days' uncertainty, an opinion "spread that the Lord Treasurer gave up the point." To Lord Strafford, June 20. 1713.

“removed out of France.” This was meant to remind the House how soon afterwards, in spite of that vote, Charles had been restored to the Throne. The Jacobites, however, having the fear of the approaching elections before their eyes, remained perfectly quiet; and the two Addresses were carried up to Her Majesty, whose answers were in the same sense, but evidently cold and constrained.

The negotiation opened in consequence at Paris led to no good result. It was always skilfully eluded by the French Ministers, and never heartily pressed by the English. Their agent, Prior, speaks of it with ridicule in his letters. “To say the truth, my dear Lord Bolingbroke, “M. de Torcy thinks us all mad. He asked me many “questions, which, for the best reason in the world, I did “not answer; as, for instance, how we can oblige a man “to go from one place when we forbid all others to “receive him?”\* But even further, it is asserted, in the secret correspondence of Gaultier, that Bolingbroke himself had, with singular baseness, privately suggested to the Duke of Lorraine the pretexts for eluding his own public demands!†

Some other proceedings of this Session seem to deserve attention. The House of Commons proposed to renew the duty on malt for another year. A question then arose whether or not this duty should be laid on the whole island; the Scotch members being most eager and vehement against bearing any share of it. Finding themselves outvoted, and the Bill passed the Commons, they held several private conferences with the Peers of their party; sent an Address to the Queen; and, finding this ineffectual, indignantly agreed to move for an Act for dissolving the Union between the two kingdoms. Such a motion was accordingly brought forward by the Earl of Findlater, on the 1st of June, and produced a long debate. Lord Peterborough indulged his lively fancy. He observed, “that though sometimes there happened a difference between man and wife, yet it did not presently break the “marriage; so, in the like manner, though England, who “in this national marriage must be supposed to be the

\* Bolingbroke's Correspondence, vol. ii. p. 678.

† To M. de Torcy, Dec. 13. and 14. 1713.

“husband, might, in some instances, have been unkind  
 “to the lady, yet she ought not presently to sue for a  
 “divorce, the rather because she had very much mended  
 “her fortune by this match.” The Duke of Argyle said,  
 “that it was true he had a great hand in making the  
 “Union: that the chief reason that moved him to it was  
 “the securing the Protestant Succession, but that he was  
 “satisfied that might be done as well now if the Union  
 “were dissolved; and that, if it were not, he did not  
 “expect long to have either property left in Scotland or  
 “liberty in England!”\*

It does not appear that Bolingbroke — undoubtedly the greatest orator of the time — took any part in the debate. But his remarks upon the subject in a letter to the Duke of Shrewsbury may excite some serious reflections at the present period: “Your Grace will wonder  
 “when I tell you that they intend to move in our House,  
 “on Monday, to dissolve the Union. You may be sure  
 “that all those whose spirits are naturally turbulent and  
 “restless — all those who have languished under expecta-  
 “tion, and all those who have any personal resentment,  
 “take this occasion to add to the cry and to pursue their  
 “own views by intermingling them in this cause. . . .  
 “We shall, I believe, ground on this motion a Bill to  
 “make it high treason, by any overt act, to attempt the  
 “dissolution of the Union. If, after this, we go on to  
 “show them all reasonable indulgence, and at the same  
 “time to show to them and to all mankind a firmness of  
 “resolution and a steadiness of conduct, good will have  
 “come out of evil, and we shall reap some benefit from  
 “this CONTRETEMPS.”†

To any one who considers either the nature of this question, or the usual feelings and conduct of the House of Lords, the division on Lord Findlater’s motion will appear not a little surprising. Fifty-four Peers voted for it, and exactly as many against it. Proxies were then called for; and, there being 13 in the affirmative, and 17 in the negative, it was rejected by a majority of only four. But the fact is, that this subject, like every other

\* Parliamentary History, vol. vi. p. 1217. See also Lockhart’s Comment. (p. 414—437.) for a very full account of this proceeding.

† Bolingbroke’s Correspondence, vol. ii. p. 409.

in the Session, was considered not so much on national as on party grounds. And if such a course could ever deserve indulgence, it would surely be at a crisis when the fate of the Hanover Succession hung trembling in the balance, and with it the fate of the Protestant establishment, of the British Constitution,—of everything that we cherish as dear, or respect as venerable.\*

Another party matter was the favour shown by the House of Commons to Dr. Sacheverell. The sentence of the House of Lords, forbidding him to preach during the space of three years, expired on the 23rd of March; and on the Sunday following he held forth, for the first time, at his own church of St. Saviour's, and, taking for his text the words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do†," drew an unseemly parallel between his own sufferings and the Redeemer's Passion. The House of Commons, anxious to show their disapprobation of the former proceedings against him, appointed him to the honour of preaching before them on the Restoration Day; and the Court was no less forward in conferring a rich benefice upon him. Never, perhaps, had any man attained a higher pitch of popularity. We are told, that as he passed to and from the House of Lords, on his trial, the by-standers used eagerly to press about him, and strive for the happiness of kissing his hands.‡ We are told that, on his journey through Wales, even our princes in their progresses could scarcely have vied with his reception §: that the day on which his sentence ex-

\* A curious account of this division is given in a letter to Swift from Erasmus Lewis, at that time M. P. for Lestwithiel. He tells us that both the Tory Peers who voted with the Lord Treasurer against the dissolution of the Union, and the Scotch who voted for it, were "under agonies" lest they themselves should be victorious! "In all the time I have been conversant in business, I never before observed both sides at the same time acting parts which they thought contrary to their interests." See Swift's Works, vol. xvi. p. 71.

† St. Luke, ch. xxiii. 34. On this sermon we find in Swift's Journal to Stella, April 2.; "I went to Lord Treasurer's at six, where I found Dr. Sacheverell, who told us that the bookseller had given him 100*l*. for his sermon preached last Sunday, and intended to print 30,000. I believe he will be confoundedly bit, and will hardly sell above half."

‡ Burnet's History, vol. ii. p. 542. fol. ed.

§ Ibid. p. 553.



pired was celebrated, not only in London, but in several parts of the country, with extraordinary rejoicings.\* Would not all this appear to imply that he must have possessed some degree of talent or of merit? Yet the concurrent testimony of some of his friends, as well as of his enemies, represents him as utterly foolish, ignorant, ungrateful—his head reeling with vanity, his heart overflowing with gall.† This venerated idol, when we come to try its substance, appears little more than a stock or a stone. But Sacheverell was considered as the representative of a popular party doctrine—as the champion and the martyr of the High Church cause; and the multitude, which always looks to persons much more than to principles, can rarely be won over, until even the clearest maxim appears embodied in some favourite leader.

The 7th of July had been appointed by the Queen as a day of public thanksgiving, for what she termed “the safe and honourable peace lately concluded.” Both Houses went in procession to St. Paul’s; and in the evening there were extensive illuminations blazing forth from the city, and magnificent fire-works played off from the river. The Queen, however, was prevented by illness from attending; and the Whigs kept aloof from a pageant which, in their eyes, must have appeared a profanation.

On the 16th of the same month the Queen was so far recovered as to be able to prorogue Parliament in person. “My Lords and Gentlemen,” she said, “at my coming to the Crown I found a war prepared for me. God has blessed my arms with many victories, and at last has enabled me to make them useful by a safe and honourable peace. I heartily thank you for the assistance you have given me therein, and I promise myself that, with your concurrence, it will be lasting. To this end I re-

\* Tindal’s History, vol. vi. p. 106.

† Sir Walter Scott truly observes: “Although the Tory Ministry was formed in consequence of the ferment raised by this silly tool, the eminent writers of their party seldom mention him but with contempt.” Note to Swift’s Works, vol. vi. p. 250. As to Sacheverell’s real principles, I have found the following entry in a “Minute of what was resolved on by his Majesty and Earl Bolingbroke,” October 14. 1715 (Stuart Papers),—“Sacheverell to make his way to the King (on his landing) unless he can be more useful in London.”

“commend it to you all to make my subjects truly sensible of what they gain by the peace.”

It is curious to contrast this address of Queen Anne with that of the Prince Regent, a century afterwards, on closing the Session of 1814. We shall find that the shameful peace of Utrecht is commended with far higher praise than the triumphant peace of Paris. It was not necessary to ask statesmen “to make my subjects truly “sensible” of the glory of the latter. We may observe, also, that the Prince Regent, in alluding to the great victories of the war, pays a proper and natural tribute to “the consummate skill and ability displayed by the great “commander whose services you have so justly acknowledged.” In Queen Anne’s speech, on the contrary, the Duke of Marlborough is meanly and enviously shut out from all notice. Did Harley and St. John really think that his glory depended on their notice, or that they could lower his fame by suppressing his praises?

The Parliament, thus prorogued, was dissolved a few days afterwards. At this period the hopes of the leading Whigs seem to have been greatly depressed. The Hanoverian Minister was told by Stanhope that “the greatest “number of country gentlemen is rather against us than “for us;” and the General added his opinion, that “if “things continue ever so short a time on the present “footing, the Elector will not come to the Crown unless “he comes with an army.”\* The Whigs made, however, the most of their cause in their appeals at the Elections. They inveighed, and not without success, against the Treaty of Commerce of their opponents. To show their concern for trade, and especially for the staple commodity of England, they in most places wore pieces of wool in their hats; while on the other hand the Tories assumed green boughs, as seeking to identify themselves with the most popular event in English history—the Restoration.†

It is a melancholy reflection for human nature, how

\* Schutz to Bothmar, Oct. 3. 1713. Macpherson, vol. ii. p. 505.

† Hist. of Europe, 1713 and 1714. I find from a letter in the Stuart Papers, that there were in like manner symbols assumed on the Pretender’s birth-day in 1716. The Jacobites wore white roses; and the Whigs farthing warming-pans! (Letter of Mr. Thos. Innes, London, June 11. 1716.)



easily and completely even the most intelligent classes of even the most intelligent people may sometimes be imposed upon. There seems some inherent proneness in mankind to great national delusions. The same men whom we find as individuals watchful and wary, not readily trusting professions, nor often misled by appearances, as a body will often swallow open-mouthed the most glaring absurdities and contradictions; and the press, which ought to be the detector of such delusions, will sometimes stoop to be their instrument. Thus, in the Elections of 1713, it is certain that a very great majority of the English people were zealously attached to the rights of the House of Hanover. The Tory administration was well known to be on ill terms with that family, and was publicly accused of favouring the cause of its rival. We might, therefore, have presumed that the people of England must needs have taken one or the other course — have cooled in their zeal either for a Protestant King, or for Jacobite Ministers. Yet, with wonderful blindness, they resolutely adhered to both; and, while devoutly praying for the Electress Sophia, as heir presumptive, while solemnly burning, on the 18th of November, amidst unanimous huzzas, figures of the Devil, the Pope, and the Pretender\*, they yet returned to Parliament a vast majority of friends to an administration which, in all its actions, studied the advantage of one at least of those three personages. The Whigs, it is true, were victorious in several places, and, on the whole, perhaps, were not losers by this election, as compared to the last; but they still formed but a feeble fraction of the House of Commons; while, in the House of Peers, on the other hand, they continued to exert a manifest ascendancy.

The scope of this work appears to me to impose the necessity, and the period of a General Election to afford the occasion, for my giving some details on the composition of both Houses at this period.

First, then, of the House of Lords. It comprised, at this period, one Prince of the Blood Royal, the Electoral

\* Hist. of Europe for 1713 and 1714, p. 203. The 18th of November was the anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's accession.

Prince of Hanover, under the title of Duke of Cambridge; twenty-two other Dukes, two Marquesses, sixty-four Earls, ten Viscounts, and sixty-seven Barons. These, with twenty-six Spiritual and sixteen Scottish Representative Peers, made up a total of 207 : several of whom, however, as Roman Catholics, could take no part in public business. In comparing these numbers with those at the accession of William the Fourth, we find them, at this later period, amount to 390, including four Spiritual and twenty-eight Temporal Representative Peers from Ireland — an increase, certainly, not at all more than commensurate with the improvement of properties and the increase of population. In fact, the proportion between the Peers and the population will be found nearly the same at both periods. Were such limits to be outstepped in any very great degree, the result could not fail to be felt injuriously by the landed interest, as withdrawing considerable proprietors from the representation of the counties, and throwing that representation into inferior hands.

Of the 207 Peerages which existed at the accession of George the First, not more than fifty-two remained unaltered at the death of George the Fourth. But the rest were by no means all extinctions. Many appear changed only from promotions in rank — as, for example, the Earls of Exeter and Salisbury ; and, on the other hand, several are continued in collateral branches, and under lower but more ancient titles, as was the case, for instance, with the Dukedom and Earldom of Shrewsbury. It may not be undeserving of notice as a singularity, that though, in 1714, the body of Peers was so much smaller than in 1830, a greater number of them held the rank of Dukes.

The House of Commons then, and throughout that century, consisted of 558 Members ; 513 being sent from England, and 45 from Scotland. It is well worthy of observation, how large a number of the family interests and local ties which still exist, or, at least, which existed before Lord Grey's administration, were in force at this early period. We find, in this Parliament, a Drake returned for Amersham, a Grimston for St. Albans, a Whitmore for Bridgnorth, a Musgrave for Carlisle, a

Cholmondeley for Cheshire, a Bathurst for Cirencester, a Bankes for Corffe Castle, a Lowther for Cumberland, a Wynn for Denbigh, a Mundy for Derby, a Foley for Droitwich, and another Foley for Hereford, a Hervey for Bury St. Edmund's, a Mostyn for Flint, an Eliot for St. Germans, a Berkeley for Gloucestershire, a Brownlow for Grantham, an A'Court for Heytesbury, Lord Hinchinbrook for Huntingdon, Sir Edward Knatchbull for Kent, a Sibthorp for Lincoln, a Walpole for Lynn, a Wentworth for Malton, a Bruce for Marlborough, a Vaughan for Merioneth, Thomas Cartwright for Northamptonshire, a Fitzwilliam for Peterborough, an Edgecombe for Plympton, a Fleetwood for Preston, a Cocks for Reigate, a Vernon for Stafford, a Cecil for Stamford, a Dowdeswell for Tewkesbury, a Greville for Warwick, and a Forester for Wenlock.\* These hereditary seats in Parliament, combining in some degree the permanence of Peerages with the popularity of Elections — these feelings of mutual kindness, which bound together our wealthy gentry and their poorer neighbours, and brought them into frequent and friendly intercourse — these bulwarks against any sudden and overwhelming tide of popular delusion — appear to me to have been one of the main causes of the good working of our ancient constitution, and, still more, of its long duration. Thanks, in great measure, to them, the constitution of England might long be compared to its country, — smooth yet not uniform, diversified yet not rugged, equally removed from the impracticable heights of democracy or the dead level of despotism!†

In support of this opinion I may be permitted to observe, that, in the times of Queen Anne as in ours, all the eminent statesmen of the age, with scarcely one ex-

\* See a list of this House of Commons in the Parliamentary History, vol. vi. p. 1246. The list is, however, incorrect in some particulars; and thus, for instance, does not contain the name of Steele. He was member for Stockbridge. (Hist. of Europe for 1713 and 1714, p. 265.)

† Dante says of Cesena, though in a different sense from that of a balanced constitution —

“Cosi com 'ella siè tra 'l piano e 'l monte

“Tra tirannia si vive e stato franco.”

*Inf. c. 27. v. 53.*

ception, owed to the smaller boroughs, now disfranchised, either their introduction into public life, or their refuge during some part of it. Lord Chancellor Cowper sat for Beralston, Lord Chancellor King for the same place, Harley for Tregony, Craggs afterwards for the same, Walpole for Castle Rising, Steele for Stockbridge, Addison for Malmesbury, Prior for East Grinstead, Stanhope for Wendover, Lord Chesterfield for St. Germain's, Palteney for Heydon, Shippen for Bramber, and Bolingbroke for Wotton Bassett! Such were the brilliant results of our late representative system. We have now irrevocably cut off the fountain head. But we wisely expect that the stream will not cease to flow!

I am not, however, a blind and indiscriminate admirer of our former Parliamentary constitution. Its most indefensible part, I mean the sale and purchase of seats, may be traced at a much earlier period than is commonly supposed. When Mr. Hallam states that this practice is never mentioned in any book that he remembers to have seen, of an earlier date than 1760\*, he, for once, departs from his usual accuracy. Thus, for instance, we find Lady Mary Montagu write to her husband in 1714, when he wished to come into Parliament, "Perhaps it will be "the best way to deposit a certain sum in some friend's "hands, and buy some little Cornish borough."† Thus also, "it is notorious," said the Earl of Dorset, in Parliament, when arguing against the system of triennial elections, "that a great number of persons have no other "livelihood than by being employed in bribing corpora- "tions."‡

Reports of the speeches in either House, which now exercise so powerful an influence upon the public mind, were at this period almost unknown. We find, indeed, some account of striking sentences, or the principal arguments of a few Parliamentary leaders. But, in the first place, these do not seem to have been brought before the public by a daily press; and, secondly, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say, that the record of a single protracted debate at the present time is longer than the record of a

\* *Constitut. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 402.

† *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 146. ed. 1820.

‡ *Parliamentary History*, vol. vii. p. 297.

whole Session in the reign of Queen Anne. Strangers, also, were much more frequently excluded than at present; and questions of foreign policy, especially, were often (as now in North America) debated with closed doors. In the Parliamentary History for March, 1714, we find that the Commons having the day before made an order for clearing the House of all strangers, not excepting the Peers, it was moved in the Lords to make the like order, without excepting the Commons. But this motion was successfully opposed by the Duke of Argyle, who said, very much in the style of a courtier, "It is for the honour of this august assembly to show "that they are better bred and have more complaisance "than the Commons!" A strange argument for legislators!

Still less was there at this period any publication of the lists of the divisions. In 1696, the printing and circulating the names of a minority in the House of Commons had been unanimously voted a breach of privilege, and "destructive of the freedom and liberties of Parliament."\* It may, however, be doubted whether the just responsibility of members to their constituents was thereby at all impaired; since, on any doubtful point, the electors would of course address an inquiry to their representative as to the vote he had given; and if even he were so utterly base as to wish to deceive them, still he could not answer falsely, whilst there were many hundred witnesses to the real fact. To suppose a question not calling for any such inquiries from constituents, is to suppose a question of very little public importance, or constituents of very little public spirit. We may, therefore, perhaps, infer that the modern practice of lists in the daily papers is more useful for the gratification of curiosity than for the maintenance of principle; and we may regret that so many hours should be wasted in the House of Commons by explanatory speeches, when the same object might be attained by explanatory letters. At present more members speak to satisfy their supporters out of doors, than to convince their opponents in the House.

In Queen Anne's reign, the place of daily reports of

\* Commons' Journals, vol. xi. p. 572.

the debates was in a great measure supplied by frequent party pamphlets. It was through these that the people were sometimes instructed and restrained, and more often spurred and goaded, in the politics of the day. Never before had England seen this paper warfare waged with such fierce and deadly rancour. Never before had it been conducted by such eminent abilities. On the one side, the Whigs could boast of the graceful and easy style, the inimitable humour and the fertile fancy of Addison; of the buoyant spirit, the keen and biting vehemence of Steele. On the other side, the Tories possessed in Swift perhaps the greatest master of satire that ever lived. He was bold, vindictive, and unscrupulous. He was seldom restrained either by delicacy or compassion. He had a thorough knowledge of all the baser parts of human nature—for they were his own. If, indeed, it be possible that an accomplished satirist should ever be an amiable man, Swift at least was not that prodigy; and his life and character appear consumed by the same fiery rancour which glows in his writings. We find him bred as a Whig, under Sir William Temple—patronised as a Whig, by Lord Somers—boasting of himself as a Whig, in his writings\*—and then, without a pretence of principle, without the slightest charge against his friends on public grounds, and merely on an allegation of personal neglect, turning round to the Tory leaders at the very moment when those leaders were coming into office, and having evidently no better reason for deserting his cause than that he thought it in danger. We find him instantly single out all his former friends for his libels, and assail them with all the deadly resentment of a renegade. The illustrious Somers, for example, his early friend, so lately held up as “the modern Aristides,” becomes “a false, deceitful rascal.”† We find him in some cases even making a boast of insincerity; and thus saying of Lord Rochester, “Though I said I ‘only talked from my love to him, I told a lie, for I do ‘not care if he were hanged.’‡ We find him now urge his greedy claims for reward upon both Bolingbroke and

\* Works, vol. iii. p. 240, &c.

† Works, vol. iii. p. 273. ; and vol. ii. p. 155.

‡ Journal to Stella, Dec. 30. 1710.



Harley; and at length, in the spring of 1713, extort the Deanery of St. Patrick's from a reluctant Queen and hollow friends. We find him, a beneficed clergyman, indite a sarcastic allegory on the principal sects of Christianity; we find him indulge in the grossest and most unseemly allusions, even when writing to a young, an unmarried, and a virtuous woman, who had become attached to him\* — a woman whom his cold-hearted cruelty afterwards hurried to an early grave. Such is my opinion of his character. I turn to his writings, and my contempt for the man is at once lost in my admiration of the author. What vigour and vivacity of style! How rich is his variety of illustration, how terrible his energy of invective! How powerfully does he cast aside to the right and to the left all extraneous or subordinate topics — grapple at once with the main matters at issue — and give battle to the whole strength of his opponents! Though nearly all written as mere occasional pieces, and to serve an immediate object, his works have been deservedly classed by posterity as permanent productions, and display more, perhaps, than any other, the whole force of plain and homely language.

It has already been mentioned, that in the reign of Queen Anne, party pamphlets and lampoons had attained a new degree of both talent and importance. The great Whig Administration had borne these attacks, for the most part, with inward soreness but ostensible indifference. It was not till a libel was heard from the pulpit, and a nickname applied in a sermon to a minister of state†, that the resentment of Godolphin drew his colleagues into the unfortunate impeachment of Sacheverell. The Tory Ministers, on the other hand, who had been, while out of office, the prime movers of these attacks, did not bear the libels, to which they in their turn became exposed, with the same patience as their predecessors. In this, as in almost every other matter, they had recourse to the most violent measures. In one day, Secretary St. John had no less than twelve booksellers and publishers

\* Journal to Stella, Oct. 4. 1710, &c.

† *Volpone* to Lord Godolphin. Another nickname applied at the time to the same nobleman, from his ungainly looks, was *Baconface*.



taken up for libels on the administration.\* Not satisfied with such activity, he, in January, 1712, brought down a message from Her Majesty to the House of Commons, complaining of the "great licence which is taken in publishing false and scandalous libels, such as are a reproach to any government;" and declaring that "this evil seems to be grown too strong for the laws now in force." The House of Commons, at that time completely under the control of St. John and his colleagues, in their answer went even beyond the Royal Message, and lamented that, "not only are false and scandalous libels printed and published against your Majesty's government, but the most horrid blasphemies against God and religion. And we beg leave humbly to assure your Majesty that we will do our utmost to find out a remedy equal to this mischief." Accordingly, in March, 1712, the House having resolved itself into Committee, Sir Gilbert Dolben moved the following Resolutions:—

"1. That the liberty taken in printing and publishing scandalous and impious libels creates divisions among Her Majesty's subjects, tends to the disturbance of the public peace, is highly prejudicial to Her Majesty's government, and is occasioned for want of due regulating the press.

"2. That all printing presses be registered with the names of the owners and places of abode; and that the author, printer, and publisher of every book set his name and place of abode thereto."

A Bill founded upon these two Resolutions was ordered by the House to be brought in; but it was dropped in the course of the Session, several Members having, as they believed, found a more effectual method for suppressing the evil in question by laying a heavy duty on all newspapers and pamphlets. This was done; and the tax, according to Swift, exceeded the intrinsic value of both the materials and the work; yet, considered as a

\* Journal to Stella, Oct. 24. 1711. St. John says himself, in one of his letters, "My Lord Marlborough's stupid chaplain continues to spoil paper. They had best, for their patron's sake as well as their own, be quiet. I know how to set them in the pillory, and how to revive fellows that will write them to death." To Mr. Harrison, Sept. 21. 1711. *Corresp.* vol. i. p. 226.

party measure, it failed in its effect: for the zeal of the Opposition, which must at all times be keener than that of the party in power, speedily found funds to continue its attacks, while the Tory writers did not always enjoy the same advantage; so that, as their chief libeller afterwards complained, this impost was "to open the mouths of our enemy and shut our own."\* In fact, no point of modern legislation seems more perplexing than that of the abuses of the public press. Their grievance—which is, in fact, power without responsibility—is great and undoubted; but a despotic remedy for them would be a greater grievance still. Under the benignant influence of a free constitution, libellers, like vermin in summer, will naturally grow and thrive. It is a matter well worthy the inquiry of an enlightened age, whether we must needs bear the lesser evil for the sake of the greater good, or whether it be possible to check the licentiousness of the press without impairing the liberty out of which it springs.

In considering this question, we must measure the mischief of libels, first, by the false opinions or inflamed resentments which they may raise amongst the people; and, secondly, by their effect on the illustrious objects of their venom. In the latter respect it is true that the very extent of the evil happily works out its own cure. So common and unscrupulous are now the attacks on every one engaged in public life, or even filling an elevated rank, that few men can fail to become completely callous and unmoved by them. But, the case, I may observe, was very different in less turbulent times, or with more sensitive tempers. How often have not such malignant falsehoods damped the brightest energies, and discouraged the most active patriotism! They have quelled spirits which had not shrunk before embattled armies, which had confronted the terrors of a Parliamentary impeachment—the Tower and the block. Of all the leading statesmen at the time of Anne, the two who appear to have pos-

\* Swift, *Four last Years of the Queen*, Works, vol. v. p. 301. I may observe, however, that a foreign ambassador writes in 1716, "Printers run great risks in printing any thing that displeases the Government." Count Gyldenborg to Gortz. London, Oct. 23. 1716. (Papers laid before Parliament.)

sessed the greatest mastery of temper and powers of self-control are Marlborough and Somers. The former, in the opinion of Adam Smith, even surpassed in these qualities all other great public characters of modern times. Yet we find both Somers and Marlborough writhing and embittered by the sting of even the most insignificant literary insects. The private letters of the Duke are filled with complaints against "the villanous way of "printing, which stabs me to the heart."\* — "I find," says Lord Somers, "that in any reign, and with any success, there will be little cause to envy any one who has "a share of the Ministry in England."† Are these, we may be allowed to ask, the feelings with which a generous country should desire its great men to regard it? Is it not also to be feared that the country may thus have lost the advantage of much enterprise and genius which would otherwise have been exerted for its service? And, above all, have we any ground to hope that the very excess of the evil, which undoubtedly works out its own cure so far as private feelings are concerned, has at all the same effect with regard to public delusion or exasperation?

From this long, but I hope not superfluous digression, I return to the schemes and proceedings of the British administration. In the period between the dissolution of the old Parliament and the meeting of the new one, in February, 1714, the party of Bolingbroke in the Cabinet appears to have exerted a decided preponderance over that of Oxford. In the same proportion as his influence increased, the tendency of every measure grew more and more in favour of the Pretender and his partisans. We have now laid open to public view, in Macpherson's and Lockhart's volumes, the most confidential correspondence of that period, secret reports from the agents both of Hanover and of St. Germain's; and it is very remarkable that, widely as these letters differ in all their views and wishes, and sources of information, they yet perfectly agree as to the fact of the new counsels of England being for the interests of the latter. The Hanoverians write with bitterness and alarm; the Jacobites in a most confident and

\* To the Duchess, April 16. 1711; and several others.

† Letter to the Duke of Shrewsbury, December, 1704.

joyous tone. "The changes," says the Jesuit Plunkett \*, "go on by degrees to the King's advantage; none but "his friends advanced or employed in order to serve the "great project. . . . . Bolingbroke and Oxford do "not set their horses together, because he (Oxford) is so "dilatary, and dozes over things, which is the occasion "there are so many Whigs chosen this Parliament. "Though there are four Tories to one, they think it "little. . . . . The Ministry must now sink or swim "with France." † So strong was, in fact, the Jacobite conviction on this point, that the Pretender wrote with his own hand recommending the Ministry to the support of his friends in England; and on the 19th of September, Nairne, his Under Secretary of State, sent a still more specific injunction to the Jacobites that they should assist the Tories at the elections, and promote all the measures of the Court.

The new appointments at that Court were likewise nearly all such as to possess no small claim to this support. Sir William Wyndham became Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Duke of Athol received the Privy Seal for Scotland, the Earl of Mar the seals of Secretary of State for the same kingdom. The vacant Bishopric of Rochester and Deanery of Westminster were both conferred on Atterbury, a Jacobite divine of great abilities and still greater ambition.

But one of the principal steps to which Bolingbroke and Ormond applied themselves for the promotion of

\* This Plunkett, under the name of Rogers, was a stirring Jacobite agent, who had previously dipped in a most detestable conspiracy against the Duke of Marlborough. He assured the Ministers that Marlborough and the principal Whigs meant to fire the City, seize the Queen, murder Oxford, &c. See Coxe's Life, vol. vi. p. 167.

† Letters dated Oct. 7. and 28. 1713. Macpherson, vol. ii. p. 439. and 446. The Queen is always termed Princess Anne, and often mentioned with bitterness on account of her conduct to her father. Several old catches against her and Queen Mary's proceedings at that time have been handed down by tradition in old Jacobite families. Here is one that I remember to have heard from a Cornish gentleman:—

"William and Mary, George and Anne —

"Four such children never had man !

"They turned their father out of door,

"And called their brother a son of a —."

their final object, and which may serve as an additional proof of it, was new-modelling the troops. Even in May we find Plunkett stating, "We are paying and discarding the army every day. It is observable those that were of Oliver's (King William's) making are laid aside."<sup>\*</sup> The Duke of Ormond was made Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, thus placing under his control the principal strongholds of the coast†; and Berwick and Edinburgh were in like manner entrusted to sure hands. But the influence of the Duke of Marlborough over troops whom he had so often led to victory and never once to failure, was naturally looked upon as a most formidable obstacle. The personal enemies of that great man were therefore eagerly brought forward by the Government, and his friends, at every opportunity, dismissed the service, or at least withdrawn from active employment. A scheme was even formed by Ormond for compelling several such officers to sell their commissions, and Government was to advance 10,000*l.* to assist some of their own creatures in becoming the purchasers.‡ But this project, fraught as it was with danger to the Hanover Succession, was happily baffled by Oxford's neglecting to provide the requisite funds; and, in fact, throughout all this period the usual inertness of that minister, and perhaps we may add his disinclination to the Jacobite cause, acted as a drag-chain on the headlong career and downward descent of his colleagues.§

It was not only in their negotiations abroad and their government at home, that the English Ministers befriended the heir of the Stuarts; they had much at heart a still more effectual step for his service, by persuading

\* Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 412. See an account of the regiments disbanded in the Journals of the House of Commons, vol. xvii. p. 293.

† A previous and ineffectual attempt had been made to induce the Earl of Dorset to give up Dover Castle. See H. Walpole's letter to Mann, May 17. 1749.

‡ See Swift's Works, vol. vi. p. 444. note.

§ Marshal Berwick observes, "*Le Trésorier différait de jour à autre de régler l'armée malgré les sollicitations du Duc d'Ormond avec lequel à l'insu d'Oxford j'étais en commerce de lettres.*" (Mem. vol. ii. p. 128.) See also the extracts from the Stuart Papers, Appendix.

him to renounce, or at least pretend to renounce, the Roman Catholic faith. An apparent accession to the Church of England was, therefore, on high authority, and on many occasions eagerly pressed upon James. In July, 1712, we find a letter from the Duke of Buckingham, urging that measure with the utmost vehemence as the one thing needful.\* In February, 1714, Oxford dictated a letter from Gaultier to the Pretender, assuring him that if he wished to be sure of the succession, it was absolutely requisite that he should dissemble his religion, or change it for that established amongst his countrymen; and that so long as he continued a Roman Catholic the Queen would do nothing for him.† The language of Bolingbroke, on many occasions, was the same; and at last he observed to Iberville, that if the Elector of Hanover ever did mount the throne of England it would be entirely through the fault of the Pretender, in refusing to do what was quite indispensable to gain the hearts of the nation and allay their apprehensions.‡ Nor were these remonstrances and wishes confined to Protestant statesmen; it appears from other letters of Iberville that several leading Catholics concurred in them.§ “According to the information I “receive on all hands,” writes that agent, “there is not “one Tory fool-hardy enough to say a single word that “shall pledge him to acknowledge King James after the “death of the Queen, nor perhaps who is really disposed “to favour him, unless he will become a member of the “Church of England. It seems to me, that within the “last few days the Protestant Jacobites speak pretty “openly in this sense. Nay more, most of them think “that he cannot hesitate or scruple to take that course. “They believe that the delay in his doing so at this dangerous crisis of the Queen’s health (a delay of which “they all disapprove) is owing only to his expecting some “assurances that if he takes that step he shall be acknowledged as the heir.”||

The Pretender was now nearly in the same situation as

\* Macpherson’s Papers, vol. ii. p. 327.

† Gaultier to the Pretender, Feb. 6. 1714.

‡ Iberville to Torcy, July 2. 1714.

§ Letters of Iberville, between June 23. and July 11. 1714.

|| Iberville to Torcy, February 26. 1714.



his great-grandfather, Henry the Fourth of France ; when many even of his Huguenot followers implored him to sacrifice his faith for the attainment of his throne. His uncle also, Charles the Second, had, in 1660, consented to suppress his secret religious predilections. But to the great and lasting honour of James he disdained any such unworthy compromise with his conscience ; and he wrote a very able letter, to be circulated amongst his partisans in England, and in which he declared his fixed determination neither to dissemble nor to change\* ; a rare and admirable instance of religious sincerity in princes. It was hoped, however, by the Pretender, that this letter might have the good effect of increasing the confidence of his friends, since he who thus preferred his conscience to his interests might be more surely relied on in his solemn promises to respect the religious establishment and constitutional rights of others. But such an argument was far too refined for popular apprehension ; his sincerity, though a merit in him, must have been a misfortune to England had he come to the throne ; and, however praiseworthy might be the sentiments of his letter, its general circulation at such a period cannot be considered otherwise than ill-timed and injudicious.

This letter, however, by no means put an end to the importunities of the Jacobites with the Pretender, nor to their exertions for him. Both continued with unabated ardour ; and the latter, at least, with good prospects of success.

On the other side, the friends of the Protestant Succession, fully aware of their danger, no less endeavoured to take their measures in case of an appeal to arms. In the absence of Marlborough, and in want of his master-mind, they considered Stanhope as their military chief ; and that general became the pivot of several important schemes and missions. He held some private conferences with the principal officers of the French refugees, a numerous body, and zealous for the Protestant cause. He despatched several officers to the opposite coasts to ascertain the movements of the troops, and to guard against the

\* See this letter in Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 525. The ill effect it had produced is mentioned by Iberville to Torcy, just before the Queen's death. July 20. 1714.

Pretender secretly collecting and landing at the head of any considerable force.\* He and his friends were also brooding over a scheme no less adventurous and decisive than that which they dreaded in their opponents; for they had it in contemplation that, on the Queen's death, or dangerous illness, or perhaps even greatly declining health, the Elector should come over with a body of troops.† Such a design was, of course, kept scrupulously secret; yet, as we shall find, it came to the knowledge of Ministers in the course of the ensuing spring. It was supported by Marlborough with all his influence, and he sent General Cadogan from abroad to concert with Stanhope the necessary arrangements for that purpose.‡ Yet the Duke positively refused to commit himself in documents, by putting his name to an association which had been framed by the most eminent of the Whigs in England, and brought to him at Antwerp by Mr. Onslow—a refusal not unattended, on their part, by some disappointment and suspicion.

The Court of Hanover, however, on this as on other occasions, showed but little readiness to second the exertions of its friends in England. The Dowager Electress was still living at the advanced age of eighty-two, and sometimes appeared jealous of the attention of her son to affairs in which she, as the next heir, considered herself chiefly concerned. From age she was slow and dilatory, as much as the Elector from temper. Both of them displayed, also, either an ill-judged parsimony, or a surprising poverty, in refusing to lay out small sums, from time to time, according to the advice and entreaties of their English correspondents. In vain was it urged upon them that a very moderate expense might secure some doubtful

\* “The officers sent by Mr. Stanhope to the Boulonnais and Flanders are returned; and report that they found no troops in motion there, only that nine Irish battalions and a regiment of dragoons were advanced from Lorraine, and in quarters at Douay, Valenciennes, and Hesdin, and that the officers said openly that they had orders to be ready to march upon a moment's warning.” Kreyenberg to Robethon, Feb. 16. 1714. Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 567.

† Macpherson, vol. ii. p. 472, &c.

‡ See Coxe's *Life of Marlborough*, vol. vi. p. 263.

elections or determine some wavering friends.\* In vain did Marlborough especially beseech the Elector not to spare his money, and offer to assist him with a loan of 20,000*l*. So far from being able or willing to enter into such expenses, the Elector, at this very period, was himself soliciting a pension for his mother from Queen Anne.†

Such means as calling in an armed force and buying mercenary partisans—the sword and the purse—appear strange expedients for securing a succession which was not only the regular and appointed course of law, but rooted in the hearts of three fourths of the English people at that period. Yet let us not too rashly condemn the statesmen who had recourse to these expedients. Let us remember how firmly established was the administration against which they had to strive: how fearful the dangers from which they finally delivered us! Nor let it be forgotten that no suspicion of any personal lucre or advantage to themselves, nor of illegal violence against their opponents, ever attached to their counsels, either for the application of money or for the landing of troops.

The broken health of the Queen, at this period, was another circumstance that stimulated both parties to exertion, as showing the importance of time. Her Majesty's constitution had in early life been injured by repeated miscarriages. Having of late years grown large and unwieldy, she could no longer take her former exercise of hunting, whilst she still continued to indulge somewhat too freely at her table: and she became subject to fits of the gout, which gradually grew more and more frequent and severe. Other ailments also intervened. On the 24th of December, she was seized with an inflammatory fever, and for several days remained alarmingly ill. Meanwhile various reports spread abroad, and, as usual, the less that was known the more there was rumoured. Even Her Majesty's death was more than once asserted. The monied men were seized with a panic.

\* Baron Schutz to Bothmar, Dec. 11. 1713. Halifax and Sunderland pressed that day for 2000*l*. "to carry the elections of the Common Council of London;" and Stanhope added, "We are all sure that being masters of the Common Council, London will present to Parliament any address we choose!"

† See Somerville's *Queen Anne*, p. 556.

The funds fell. A run was made upon the Bank, and a deputation hastened up in fear and trembling to the Lord Treasurer, to request his advice and assistance. Under his direction, the Queen wrote a letter to the Lord Mayor announcing her recovery<sup>\*</sup>; and a short time afterwards still more satisfactorily confirmed her own account, by arriving in London and opening Parliament in person.

The alarm, however, caused by Anne's undoubted jealousy of Hanover, and supposed predilection towards St. Germain's, was not so easily appeased. The ground for it, in fact, grew daily stronger. One of the first objects of Lord Bolingbroke and Mrs. Masham had been to remove as much as possible from Court all warm partisans of the Hanover Succession. None of these were left about Her Majesty, except the Duke and Duchess of Somerset, who afforded no handle for dismissal. The Duke was Master of the Horse, a well-meaning man, but of shy proud habits and slender understanding; insomuch that, on one occasion, we find Marlborough justifying himself as from a serious imputation, from any idea of having trusted or employed him in affairs of importance.<sup>†</sup> The Duchess, on the other hand, was a bold, imperious woman, with all that firmness of mind which her husband wanted. It was found that she was accustomed to ply the timid conscience of the Queen with hints on the terrors of Popery and the duty of securing the Protestant establishment. The floodgates of party virulence were instantly opened upon her; and a Protestant clergyman led the van against the inconvenient Protestant zealot. In his "Windsor Prophecy," Swift poured forth some most vehement invectives against the Duchess, reproaching her with having red hair, and with having connived at the murder of her first husband. It is difficult to guess which of these two accusations the Duchess resented most deeply, the latter being without a shadow of foundation, while the former, unhappily, could not be denied. To tell the truth of a

\* See this letter, dated February 1., in Tindal (vol. vi. p. 136.).

† "I beg you will have so kind an opinion of me as to believe I can't be so indiscreet as to employ the Duke of Somerset in any thing that is of consequence." To the Duchess, July 19. 1708. Swift says of Somerset, that he "had not a grain of judgment; hardly 'common sense.'" Works. vol. x. p. 300.

lady's person is sometimes still more unpardonable than to spread falsehoods about her character. Certain it is, however, that the Duchess of Somerset became Swift's most deadly enemy, and, by her influence with her Royal mistress, was one of the principal means of excluding him from higher church preferment.

It may easily be supposed that however strong might have been Anne's Jacobite predilections, she found it necessary to conceal them with great care; and this was especially the case, since in her mind they were so frequently struggling with natural timidity and conscientious fears for the Established Church. Yet, in more than one instance, her family feelings burst through the veil which usually surrounded them. One of these is related by Lockhart of Carnwath. That zealous Jacobite having brought up what he terms a "high monarchical" address from the county of Edinburgh, was told by the Queen that she did not doubt his affection to her person, and hoped that he would not concur in any design to bring over the Prince of Hanover during her lifetime. Somewhat surprised at this sudden mark of confidence, "I told her," says Lockhart, "that Her Majesty might judge from the address I had read, that I should not be acceptable to my constituents if I gave my consent for bringing over any of that family, either now or at any time hereafter. At this," adds Lockhart, "she smiled, and I withdrew, and then she said to the Duke of Hamilton she believed I was an honest man and a fair dealer."\*

\* Lockhart's Comment. p. 317.

## CHAPTER III.

ALTHOUGH the scope of this work does not lead me to notice, in detail, the merely local affairs of Scotland or Ireland, I must not omit that both the sister countries were then in a state of extraordinary ferment. In both, the Jacobite leaven was working far more strongly than in England; and it can scarcely be doubted, but that in Scotland that party comprised a majority, not only as to numbers, but also as to property. The Whig Ministers had constantly kept a very apprehensive eye upon the Highland chiefs, whom they knew to have generally most disaffected principles, and always most devoted followers. I may even assert, that the fierce and nearly fatal struggle which finally took place in 1745 had been clearly foreseen and anticipated, even in the reign of Queen Anne; and it has been a matter of just reproach to Walpole, that, preferring present ease to future safety, he did not, during his twenty years of peace and power, bring forward any measures to break the discipline and avert the danger of these military bodies. So early as 1708, Stanhope had introduced a bill for that object, but had not been able to carry it through. The administration which came to the helm in 1710 was, as may well be supposed, by no means inclined to destroy these useful and ever ready weapons of the Jacobites; on the contrary, it even secretly assisted them with money. Their own Solicitor General for Scotland, Sir James Stewart, declared in the House of Commons, that, to his certain knowledge, 3000*l.* or 4000*l.* had been yearly remitted to the most decided of the Highland clans.\* For this discovery Stewart was dismissed from office, but it formed the subject of a keen attack from the Duke of Argyle in the House of Lords. Oxford admitted the fact; but said

\* Parl. Hist. vol. vi. p. 1275., and Lockhart's Comment. p. 459.



in his defence that he had only followed the example of King William, who, after reducing the Highland clans, had allowed still more considerable pensions as hush-money.\* Nothing was alleged against this apology, and the Lord Treasurer's conduct was approved by the House. It may be observed, however, that if the payments of King William had been suspended during several years, there was required a reason as well as a precedent before they were renewed.

On the whole, it must be admitted that to rule Scotland at this period was a task of no ordinary difficulty. Its system of administration was, no doubt, fraught with gross and manifold abuses; but I believe that even the highest degree of perfection would not have secured it against the animosity and accusation of the Scotch. That high-spirited people bore with impatience any government from London. The ideas of subjugation and dependence were constantly floating before their eyes, and lending a distorted medium to every object they surveyed. In no part of their dominions had the Stuarts been urged to exercise such arbitrary and grinding power; in none had William the Third encountered more harassing and vexatious opposition. Even his practised patience had become at length exhausted. On one occasion, when the Duke of Hamilton was extolling Scotland to him, "My Lord," exclaimed His Majesty, "I only wish that it was a hundred thousand miles off, and that you were King of it!" The Union, which was designed as a remedy to these heartburnings, proved at first only their aggravation. Never did a treaty produce more ultimate advantage to a nation; never was any received with such general and thorough hatred.† I

\* Parl. Hist. vol. vi. p. 1339. The payments of King William were made through the Earl of Breadalbane. It is said that, on being asked by the minister for a particular account of his disbursements, Breadalbane replied, "Why, my Lord, the money is spent — the Highlanders are quiet — and, that is the only way of accounting among friends!" Chambers's *Rebellions of 1689 and 1715*, p. 325.

† Swift calls it with his usual felicitous expression,

"Blest Revolution! which creates  
"Divided hearts, united States!"

have already had to detail the violent attempt made in the House of Lords for its repeal; but that repeal was constantly held out as a bait by the Scotch Jacobites; and some even went so far as to declare that if they failed in regaining their freedom, they hoped at least to be able to deprive us of ours!\*

Ireland, at this period, was scarcely in a more tranquil situation. The Ministers had sent in the autumn, as Lord Lieutenant, one of the most prominent characters of the age, the Duke of Shrewsbury. After having been connected in turn with almost every party, Shrewsbury's views as to the great point of the Succession might at this time be considered doubtful. During his administration in the reign of William, he had stooped to a treasonable correspondence with St. Germain's. On the other hand, when passing through Paris, on his way to Italy, he had, if indeed we may trust his own account in his journal†, skilfully parried an indirect proposal from that quarter. On the other hand, again, decided Jacobite partialities might be presumed from the part he had taken in tripping up the Whig administration of 1710, and from the trust reposed in him by the opposite party. Had he not been expected to come into the secret views of Bolingbroke and Ormond, he would surely never have been stationed at such confidential posts as Paris and Dublin. Yet, as will appear in the sequel, he deceived these Ministers as he had their predecessors; his old principles triumphed, and, at the last crisis, he came forth a most timely and useful assertor of the Protestant cause.

The Duke arrived at Dublin on the 27th of October.

\* As a remarkable instance of this bitter feeling, see the conversation between Stanhope and Lockhart, as reported by the latter. (Comment. p. 479.) "As you Englishmen," said Lockhart, "have made slaves of us Scotchmen, I should be glad to see you reduced to the same state!"

† "My old acquaintance, the Duke of Lauzun, one day took occasion to commend the Prince of Wales, and wished that by any means I might have an opportunity of seeing so fine a youth. I told him I questioned not his merit, but had no great curiosity. But if I must see him, I would much rather it were here than in England. This reply dashed all further discourse of this kind." Corresp. p. 185.

His instructions were to take the same line as the Government in England; to profess unabated zeal for the House of Hanover, and thus lull the public apprehensions, and prevent a Protestant cry at the elections. Accordingly, he seized the first opportunity, at a public entertainment, to declare that "he was still the same as in 1688," and to drink to the "pious and glorious memory of King William;" which, in Ireland, has always been a favourite party symbol. Soon afterwards, a riot having taken place in the Dublin election, and being, of course, like every other mischief, imputed to the Roman Catholics, the Duke ordered several of their chapels to be closed. Yet, with all his pains and professions, the Irish elections turned for the most part in favour of the Opposition. Scarcely had Parliament met before a struggle ensued in the Commons as to the choice of Speaker; and Sir Alan Brodrick, the Whig candidate, was elected by a majority of four. The Whig party fell next upon the Lord Chancellor, Sir Constantine Phipps, who had lately countenanced the Jacobites almost without disguise, and an Address was voted to the Queen for his removal. On the other side, the Lords, where the Court party was the stronger, took up the Chancellor's cause, passed a counter-Address in his favour, and severely censured Mr. Nuttall, a lawyer, for having called his Lordship "a canary-bird," which, it seems, is an Hibernian term of reproach. It became evident that a collision was preparing between both Houses, and that the Lower was ripe for the most violent determinations. In this state of things, the Ministers, not less afraid of its effects in Ireland than of its example in England, sent directions to Shrewsbury to prorogue the Parliament, and it sat no more this reign. The Duke, on his part, anxious to watch the progress of events at Court, obtained leave of absence, and set out for England, leaving Sir Constantine Phipps and two Archbishops as Lords Justices.

That more important assembly, the Parliament of Great Britain, met on the 16th of February, 1714, and though the Tories had a large and undoubted majority in this House of Commons, yet here, also, the choice of Speaker fell upon a member who had lately opposed several of their measures, Sir Thomas Hanmer. No person was

even set up on the other side; partly on account of the weight and merit of Sir Thomas, partly because Oxford and Bolingbroke had hopes of regaining him and the other moderate Tories, and partly from their difficulty in agreeing amongst themselves as to the choice of a candidate.

The earliest attention of both Houses was turned to the public press, and to those pamphlets of which the preceding chapter gave a full account. Her Majesty's opening speech had contained a "wish that effectual care "had been taken, as I have often desired, to suppress "those seditious papers and factious rumours by which "designing men have been able to sink public credit, and "the innocent have suffered. There are some who are "arrived to that height of malice as to insinuate that the "Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover is in "danger under my government!"

It soon appeared that, as far as this system of libels was concerned, both Houses, though in very opposite directions, were smarting from its stings. The Tory House of Commons proceeded against the "*Crisis*," a new pamphlet of Steele's.\* The Whig House of Lords proceeded against an answer to that pamphlet, called "*The Public Spirit of the Whigs*." Swift was well known to be the author, but had not affixed nor announced his name; so that the anger of the Peers could wreak itself only on the publisher and printer. These were immediately summoned to the bar. And here it may be observed that Swift, throughout his whole career, never showed the slightest scruple at allowing his underlings to suffer in his place, nor thought of relief to them by exposure of himself. The alleged ground of offence in "*The Public Spirit of the Whigs*" was a bitter and insulting attack upon the whole Scottish nation in treating of the Union; and the majority of the House took up the

\* The "*Crisis*" is a very poor performance. Sir Walter Scott says of it, "It is chiefly a digest of the Acts of Parliament respecting the "Succession, mixed with a few comments, of which the diction is "neither forcible, elegant, nor precise; while by the extraordinary "exertions made to obtain subscriptions it is plain that the relief of "the author's necessities was the principal object of the publication." *Life of Swift*, p. 185.

matter warmly. The Lord Treasurer, on his part, protested he knew nothing of the pamphlet, exclaimed against the malicious insinuations contained in it, and readily joined in an order for committing the publisher and printer to the custody of the Black Rod.

It may assist our judgment of Oxford's character to observe, that at the very time he was thus professing his ignorance of the author, and his detestation of the book, he wrote a letter to Swift in a counterfeit hand, expressing his sympathy, and enclosing a bill for 100*l*.\* Lord Wharton, however, still pressed to have Barber, the printer, closely examined, with a view of discovering the "villanous author." But the artifice of Oxford warded off the blow. He directed a prosecution against Barber himself, which rendered his evidence as to the author no longer admissible in law. The Scottish Peers, headed by the Duke of Argyle, now went up in a body to the Queen, with a demand for vengeance on the insult they had suffered. At their request a proclamation was issued, which promised a reward of 300*l*. for discovering the author of the libel; but this and the other legal measures were skilfully dropped by the Lord Treasurer as soon as the clamour had abated.

In the Commons, Steele having put his name to his pamphlet, and being a member of the House, suffered far more severely than Swift in the Lords. The party tone of his former essays in the *Tatler*, and the triumph of his late election, had made him peculiarly hateful to the Tories; and their animosity against him burst forth on the very first day of the Session. Sir Thomas Hanmer having been proposed as Speaker, Steele, somewhat presumptuously, perhaps, for a new member, rose to support the nomination. "I rise up," he said, "to do him honour"—words which immediately drew from the majority

\* The letter was as follows :— "I have heard that some honest men who are very innocent are under trouble, touching a printed pamphlet. A friend of mine, an obscure person, but charitable, puts the enclosed bill in your hands to answer such exigencies as their case may immediately require. And I find he will do more, this being only for the present." The name and the date are given in Swift's endorsement, and the letter is printed with his Works (vol. xvi. p. 126.).



an ironical cry of "Tatler! Tatler!" and, as he afterwards came out, he was greeted with—"It is not so easy "a thing to speak in the House"—"He fancies because "he can scribble"—; and other such sneering observations. These, however, were but the first mutterings of the impending storm.\* It burst on the 11th of March by a direct attack from Mr. Hungerford, (a lawyer, who had been expelled a former House of Commons for bribery,) seconded by Auditor Foley, a kinsman of the Lord Treasurer. They quoted some passages in the "Crisis," which implied that the Hanover Succession was in danger under Her Majesty's government, and took good care to apply to the Queen what was intended for the Ministry. So determined was the hostility of the Court party, that it was not without much demur that a week was allowed to Steele to prepare for his defence; and on the appointed day Auditor Foley actually moved that he should withdraw without making any defence at all! The latter proposal was, however, too gross and glaring to be admitted. Steele, nevertheless, did not think proper to take his seat on the side-benches as a member, but stood at the bar as a culprit, with Stanhope on one side, and Walpole on the other. Addison also sat near, and prompted him upon occasion. Thus ably supported, he spoke for nearly three hours, with great eloquence and spirit, and then retired. It was now generally expected that Foley would sum up the case, and answer the defence paragraph by paragraph. But the Auditor, confident of his ready majorities, and thinking further trouble needless, contented himself with saying, "Without amusing the House with long speeches, it is plain "that the writings that have been complained of are "seditious and scandalous, injurious to her Majesty's Government, the Church, and the Universities; and I "move that the question should be put thereupon."

This motion occasioned a very warm debate, in which there were several powerful speeches on the side of Steele. But of these the most remarkable were those of Walpole and Lord Finch. "By the present mode of proceeding,"

\* See Mr. Steele's apology, printed in the Parl. Hist. vol. vi. p. 1286.



said the former, "Parliament, which used to be the "scourge only of evil Ministers, is made by Ministers "the scourge of the subject. . . . Mr. Steele is only "attacked because he is the advocate for the Protestant "Succession. The cause which he so ably defends gives "the offence. Through his sides the Succession is to "be wounded. His punishment will be a symptom that "the Succession is in danger, and the Ministry are now "feeling the pulse of Parliament to see how far they may "be able to proceed. . . . From what fatality does it "arise that what is written in favour of the Protestant "Succession, and countenanced by the late Ministry, is "deemed a libel on the present administration?"\*

Lord Finch was son of the celebrated Tory leader, Nottingham. He owed some personal obligations to Steele, who had formerly refuted a libel on his sister. He now rose to defend her defender: but addressing the House for the first time, and overcome by the bashfulness usually felt on that occasion, he found all his attempts to express himself in vain, and sat down in confusion, merely saying, "It is strange I cannot speak for this man, though "I could readily fight for him." These words being overheard, produced a general feeling in his favour; the whole House rang with encouraging "Hear! Hears;" and thus called on, Lord Finch rose a second time, and delivered a speech fraught with high public spirit and natural eloquence. He particularly justified Steele in his reflections on the Peace of Utrecht. "We may," he said, "give it all the fine epithets we please, but epithets "do not change the nature of things. We may, if we "please, call it here honourable; but I am sure it is "accounted scandalous in Holland, Germany, Portugal, "and over all Europe except France and Spain. We "may call it advantageous; but all the trading part of "the nation find it to be otherwise: and if it be really "advantageous, it must be so to the Ministry that made it."

Such was the beginning of a public career which, though not illustrious, was long, useful, and honourable. As Earl of Winchelsea and Nottingham, Lord Finch

\* The notes of this speech were found amongst Sir Robert Walpole's papers, and are published by Coxe in his *Life*, vol. i. p. 44.

formed part of several administrations, and held his last cabinet office above half a century from the time of his outset.\*

Of the speeches delivered against Steele no account appears. But when the question was put, that his publication should be declared a scandalous libel, and the author expelled the House, it was carried by 245 votes against 152—a most fierce and unwarrantable stretch of party violence.

Soon after this transaction, a generous effort was made in the House of Lords on behalf of the ill-fated Catalans. The treatment of that poor people by Oxford's administration is perhaps the foulest of all the blots upon its memory. They had first been roused to revolt at the instigation of England. In the name of the Queen had Lord Peterborough summoned them to arms, and solemnly promised to secure to them their ancient Fueros, or provincial liberties. Under this belief had they nobly fought and suffered. Through their aid had the Austrian cause been for several years maintained in Spain, and its standards twice seen to float from the towers of Madrid. That cause, it is true, was laid prostrate for ever in the burning streets of Brihuega and the bloody plain of Villa Viciosa. But it fell from no fault of the Catalans themselves. They had performed, and were even yet performing, their part of the contract, while ours, on the contrary, was shamefully withheld. At the Peace of Utrecht, their promised Fueros were utterly neglected by the English plenipotentiaries, and nothing beyond an amnesty (that is, mere personal pardon) was stipulated for them. We even find Lord Bolingbroke sneering at what he calls their "obstinaey,"† and attempting to prove that "it is not for the interest of England to preserve the "Catalan liberties!"‡

The shamelessness of Lord Bolingbroke's conduct will

\* He resigned the Presidency of the Council in July, 1766, and died in 1769, aged 81. Lord Waldegrave says of him, that at the Admiralty, "his whole conduct was so unexceptionable, that faction "itself was obliged to be silent." (Memoirs, p. 139.)

† Letter to the Queen, Dec. 17. 1713, in Lord Bolingbroke's Correspondence.

‡ Case of the Catalans, in Tindal's History, vol. vi. p. 258.

appear yet more glaring, if we contrast it with that which the same people had received from the French, and remember that the French, with all their great qualities, have never been thought remarkable for a liberal interpretation or an exact fulfilment of their treaties. These are points on which we have often, and not always unjustly, compared their faith with the Punic. But on this occasion they might well have retaliated upon ours. During the reign of Philip the Fourth, the Catalans had risen in another insurrection against the Castillian government.\* In that insurrection they had received assistance from the French, as in the latter from the English. In both cases had there been mutual engagements, in both were their struggles for independence finally foiled; but did the French forsake them at the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659, as the English at the Peace of Utrecht in 1712? So far from it, that we find the 55th article of that treaty provide, in the most positive manner, for the restoration and maintenance of the Catalan Fueros†; and what is more, we find that under the guarantee of France these privileges were effectually respected.

The Catalans, now forsaken by their Austrian as well as by their English allies, and opposed to both the monarchies of France and Spain, yet stood heroically firm, and determined to wage the contest for their freedom single-handed. But their noble spirit failed to rouse any sense of justice or humanity in Bolingbroke; and so far from befriending them, by word or deed, he now prepared to assist in their reduction, and to fill up the measure of his own disgrace by despatching an English squadron to the Mediterranean. The Admiral, Sir James Wishart, was directed, in his first instructions, “to repair with the

\* The Catalan wars of that century might form a very interesting narrative. When Dr. Dunham observes, that “for the domestic portion of this and much of the following reign, there are no native contemporary authorities extant; at least we know of none;” (*Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, vol. v. p. 93.) he overlooks the *Guerra de Cataluña en tiempo de Felipe IV., por Don Francisco de Melo*; one of the most valuable and authentic historical records in the Spanish language. See Mr. Dunlop’s *Memoirs of Spain*, vol. i. p. 287.

† See the *Corps Diplomatique*, ed. 1728, vol. vi. part 2. p. 271. Lord Clarendon is very inaccurate in what he says on this point. (*Mist. of Rebell.* vol. vii. p. 355. Oxf. ed.)

“fleet before Barcelona, then besieged by the enemy, and  
“demand immediate payment of the value of the Queen’s  
“stores in the town, or a sufficient security for payment  
“in some reasonable time : to take care to time his arri-  
“val before the town according to the advices from Lord  
“Bingley (then designed to be sent to Madrid as ambas-  
“sador) : by the strongest representations to induce the  
“regency of Barcelona to accept of the terms that shall  
“be obtained for them : to take all the necessary measures  
“pursuant to the Queen’s intentions to put an end to the  
“confusions that now reign in those parts, and all proper  
“methods of persuasion to induce the inhabitants of Ma-  
“jorca to submit to the terms that shall be offered them ;  
“and, in case of refusal, to employ his squadron in coun-  
“tenancing and assisting all attempts which may be  
“made for reducing them to a due obedience.”\* On  
these instructions, we may observe, first, that England  
was under the same engagements to secure the privileges  
of Majorca as those of Catalonia at the time Sir James  
Wishart received direct orders to attack the former ; and,  
secondly, that the whole expedition was planned in con-  
cert with, and in deference to, Sir Patrick Lawless, the  
Spanish envoy in London, who, during the preceding  
September, had presented a memorial to Bolingbroke,  
stating that “His Catholic Majesty hopes the Queen will  
“order a squadron of her ships to reduce his subjects to  
“their obedience.” Thus England was actually not  
merely forsaking her faithful and ill-fated allies, but  
leaguering herself with France and Spain against them !

It was at this point that the House of Lords, with a  
generous feeling of compassion, took up the cause of the  
oppressed. The first step—a motion for papers on the  
17th of March—was not opposed by the Ministry. On  
the 31st, the subject was resumed by Lord Cowper’s  
moving an Address to the Queen, “That her endeavours  
“for preserving to the Catalans the full enjoyment of  
“their ancient liberties having proved ineffectual, their  
“Lordships made it their humble request that she would  
“continue her interposition in the most pressing manner  
“in their behalf.” Lord Cowper was ably supported by

\* See the case of the Catalans, p. 261.

his former colleagues, Sunderland and Halifax; while on the other part, Bolingbroke declared "that the Queen "had used her endeavours to procure to the Catalans the "enjoyment of their ancient liberties and privileges; but "that, after all, the engagements she had entered into "subsisted no longer than while King Charles was in "Spain!" But that miserable subterfuge (then urged for the first time) made no impression on the House. The Ministers found it necessary to lower their tone; and Lord Chancellor Harcourt could only observe, that the Address would be more welcome to Her Majesty if the word "ineffectual," as applied to her former endeavours, were left out. Thus amended, the Address passed without opposition, and was presented the next day.\* Her Majesty's answer was as follows:—

"My Lords,—I heartily thank you for this Address, "and the satisfaction you express in the endeavours I "have used for securing the Catalans their just liberties. "At the time I concluded my peace with Spain, I resolved "to continue my interposition, upon every other proper "occasion, for obtaining those liberties, and to prevent, "if possible, the misfortunes to which that people are "exposed by the conduct of those more nearly concerned "to help them." The last sentence is an evident and angry allusion to the Cabinet of Vienna.† But the Address of the House of Lords was by no means fruitless of relief for the Catalans. Bolingbroke immediately sent fresh orders to Sir James Wishart not to appear before Barcelona, nor to attack the Majorcans till he should hear from Lord Bingley and receive directions from England; and Lord Bingley's instructions were also (in appearance at least) considerably modified.

Meanwhile the Lord Treasurer greatly surprised the House by moving for leave to bring in a bill "For the "further security of the Protestant Succession, by making

\* The Lords obtained also the concurrence of the Commons in this address. Commons' Journals, vol. xvii. p. 575.

† This was the tone taken by all the Ministerial writers of the time: "How dreadful," says Swift, in his *Public Spirit of the Whigs*, "must "be the doom of those who hindered these people from submitting to "the gentle terms offered them by their Prince!" &c. *Works*, vol. iv. p. 446.



“it high treason to bring in any foreign troops into the “kingdom.” At first sight, this measure seemed to point at St. Germain’s; but it was, in reality, directed against Hanover, and adverted to the secret design, already mentioned, of bringing over the Elector with a body of troops. Bolingbroke, however, dissembling his real drift, and finding himself hard pressed by the Opposition, observed, in the course of the debate, that he doubted not his noble friend who had introduced the motion meant only such foreign troops as might be brought into the kingdom by the Pretender. This the Lord Treasurer himself confirmed. But it was answered that, in that case, such a bill was altogether unnecessary; and that the law already provided sufficient weapons, such troops being either open enemies, if foreigners, or traitors and rebels, if natives; and on the whole, the motion was so coldly received by the House, that it does not seem to have been carried further.

The Ministers, however, undaunted by this check, attempted to retrieve their reputation by a decisive vote in both Houses, that the Protestant Succession was not in danger under Her Majesty’s government. In the Lords, this question came on early in April. The debate was very remarkable, from the fact that a body of Peers, hearty friends to the Protestant Succession, but holding Tory politics, and hitherto supporters of the Tory Administration, separated from it on this trying occasion. The chief of these were the Archbishop of York and several other prelates; the Earls of Abingdon, Jersey, and Anglesea, Lords Ashburnham and Carteret. Anglesea was especially hostile in his language: looking full at the Treasurer, he said, that “if he found himself imposed upon, he durst pursue an evil Minister from the Queen’s closet to the Tower, and from the Tower to the scaffold.” But, in spite of this schism, the Ministerial vote was passed by seventy-six against sixty-four; and thus, in fact, it was passed by the twelve Peers of the new creation.

The House of Commons, on the 15th, displayed a similar scene. The House having, on the motion of Sir Edward Knatchbull, resolved itself into Committee on the same question of the Protestant Succession being out of



danger, there appeared, as in the Lords, a secession from the Government of many moderate Tories, (the Hanoverian Tories, as they were then termed,) with the Speaker at their head. A very powerful speech from him drew over a considerable number on this occasion; and, on the division, the Court could only muster 256 against 208. Next day, on reporting the Resolution to the House, another fierce debate arose. Walpole applauded the public spirit of the Speaker, but added, that he despaired of seeing truth prevail; since, notwithstanding the weight of a person of his known integrity and eloquence, the majority of votes had carried it against reason and argument. Stanhope endeavoured to prove the Protestant Succession in danger by this single induction, that, as was universally acknowledged, it had been the French King's intention, so it was still his interest, and he had it more than ever in his power, to restore the Pretender. But the Opposition did not venture on a second division.

In the Lords, the Whigs showed their resentment in a far less justifiable manner. The Earl of Wharton moved, that Her Majesty might be requested "to issue out a proclamation, promising a reward to any person who should apprehend the Pretender dead or alive." The last clause—a direct encouragement to murder—might disgrace even a barbarous age and a false religion; and it is with great regret that I find such illustrious names as Halifax and Cowper ranged in defence of this savage and unchristian proposal. They, Whigs as they were, by a strange anomaly, relied mainly on the precedent of James the Second, in setting a price on the head of his nephew the Duke of Monmouth: so inconsistent do men sometimes become from party spirit! To oppose this Address was by no means safe or prudent at that time, as laying open the opponent to the charge of Jacobitism; yet Lords North and Trevor did not shrink from this duty. The former concluded his speech by saying, that no man had more respect and affection for the House of Hanover, or would do more to serve them than himself; but that they must excuse him if he would not venture damnation for them. The latter moved as an amendment, "That the reward should be for apprehending and bringing the Pretender to justice, in case he should land or attempt

“to land.” Many of the Whig peers concurred with the amendment; all the Whig bishops had withdrawn from the debate; and the House of Lords, to their honour, rejected Lord Wharton’s proposal.

The House of Lords, on the same day, passed two Resolutions: 1. That no person, not included in the Articles of Limerick, and who had borne arms in France or Spain, should be capable of any employment, civil or military. 2. That no person, who is a natural born subject of her Majesty, should be capable of sustaining the character of public Minister from any foreign potentate.—These Resolutions were levelled entirely at Sir Patrick Lawless, an Irishman, who was then in London as agent from the Court of Spain in the treaty of commerce. He had been an adherent of James the Second, had intrigued in the cause of his son, was in frequent and close communication with Bolingbroke, and held the Roman Catholic faith. All these might be just grounds of jealousy; but, as mere truth and reason have seldom sufficient weight with the vulgar, some of the leading Whigs did not scruple to add several absurd and groundless allegations. Walpole had even gone so far as to allude to him, in the House of Commons, as a man “strongly suspected of “having imbrued his hands in the blood of the late “Duke of Medina Celi and Marquis of Leganez,”\*—an utter calumny. The Ministers, however, wisely yielded to the popular prejudice; and sent to Lawless a friendly suggestion to withdraw into Holland.

In the midst of these Parliamentary proceedings, the Ministers were thrown into the greatest confusion by an unexpected diplomatic demand. The Hanoverian envoy, Baron Schutz, had, instead of any precise instructions from his Court, received an order to consult and be guided by Somers, Halifax, Cowper, and other undoubted friends of the Protestant Succession. All of them were, at this period, unanimous in thinking that their great object could not be better secured than by the presence of one of the Hanover family in England. So long as they had indulged any hope of regaining the Queen’s favour, they had been unwilling to urge, or even to allow,

\* Coxe’s Life, vol. i. p. 45.

a measure which they knew to be peculiarly distasteful to Her Majesty ; but seeing her now thoroughly wedded to Tory counsels, they looked much more to the safety of her legal successor than to her own satisfaction. They saw, besides, that the active intrigues of the Jacobites could only be withstood by equal activity and vigour on the other side ; and their plan was that the Electoral Prince, having been created a Peer by the title of Duke of Cambridge, should come over and take his seat. With such views, and under the guidance of these statesmen, Schutz, on the 12th of April, suddenly waited upon Lord Chancellor Harcourt, and told him that he had orders from the Electress Sophia to ask for the writ of the Prince as Duke of Cambridge. The Chancellor, much discomposed, changed colour and looked down\* ; and, after a long pause, answered that he would speak of it to the Queen. On Schutz's taking his leave, the Chancellor followed him to the door, and begged him to observe that he had not refused the writ, but only wished, in the first place, to take Her Majesty's orders. A cabinet council was immediately summoned. At its conclusion, Harcourt wrote drily to the envoy, stating that the Queen, not having received the least information of that demand from him, or in any other manner whatsoever from the Court of Hanover, could hardly persuade herself that he acted by direction from thence ; but that the writ of the Duke of Cambridge had been sealed at the same time with all the others, and lay ready to be delivered to the envoy whenever he called for it. It soon appeared how great was the resentment of the Queen, and the perplexity of Ministers. Three days after Schutz had an interview with the Lord Treasurer. "He told me," says the envoy in his despatches, "that he never saw the Queen in a greater passion. . . . He said I ought to have addressed myself to the Secretary of State, or to him, who would not have failed to advise very properly in the affair ; protesting that he had no service more at heart, after the Queen's, than that of the Electoral family ; and that he was vexed at what had happened, the Queen taking it as the greatest mark of contempt that could

\* See an account of this conversation in the despatch of Schutz to Robethon, April 13. 1714. Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 590.

“be given her. He added, that had it not been for this incident, Her Majesty would have invited the Electoral Prince to pay her a visit next summer, forgetting that he had told me, but a moment before, that she was too much afraid to see any of the Electoral family here, and that, this alone excepted, she would willingly grant everything else that could be demanded of her. He heaped together several very unintelligible things in this discourse.”\*

It also appears that Oxford, in this conversation, advised Schutz, as a friend, to appear no more at Court. Finding that Schutz was not disposed to take this hint, it was followed two days after by a positive and formal injunction from the Secretary of State; and he was informed, at the same time, that the Queen considered his conduct as a grievous insult, and had directed her Minister to solicit his immediate recall from the Elector. Alarmed at this, and having acted without special orders, Schutz set out himself for Hanover, to convey the writ and justify his conduct in demanding it.

At first sight this transaction appears, no doubt, honourable to the zeal and sincerity of the Whigs. But a close and impartial examination tends, on the contrary, in some degree to disparage the course which they pursued on this occasion. It was generally known that the Queen had always entertained a rooted and unconquerable aversion to the presence of any of the Electoral family in England. Besides that weak minds often shrink from the sight of an heir, as reminding them of death, she might justly fear the cabals and intrigues which would gather round the Court of her intended successor; and might remember how much she herself, in that very situation, had been able to thwart and embarrass the Government of William. She might remember the jealousy and apprehension which Queen Elizabeth, from the very first period of her reign, had manifested against acknowledging the claim, or receiving the visit, of Mary of Scots.† In short, it was positively certain that Her

\* See Macpherson's Papers, vol. ii. p. 599.

† See Buchanan's History of Scotland, 17th Book. “I will be Queen of England as long as I live,” says Elizabeth. “What! do you think I am willing to have my grave-clothes always before my

Majesty would never willingly allow any of the Hanover family to reside in England, and that no Minister of hers could venture to propose it.

Such had been the state of things so early as 1705. In that year the Whigs were in place, and the Tories in opposition. The ground of the two parties was opposite to what it became nine years afterwards, and their conduct was opposite also. In 1705 the Tories, wishing, on the one hand, to harass the Government, and, on the other hand, to manifest their own attachment to the Protestant Succession, brought forward motions in both Houses to invite the Princess Sophia, as presumptive heir, to come over to England. The Whigs, being then in office, and compelled to take the orders of the Queen, withstood, with all their might, this plausible proposal, and argued that, in a matter of that delicate and domestic nature, the inclinations of Her Majesty were not to be coldly overlooked, still less openly opposed.\* The proposal was, however, so entirely in accordance with the general principles of the Whigs, that several amongst them in both Houses, with the Archbishop of Canterbury at their head, refused to take part against it, and joined with the Tories on that question. Such men might, with perfect propriety and consistency, pursue, in 1714, the same object they had already urged in 1705. But, with regard to the main body of the Whigs, I must own, notwithstanding my approval and admiration of their general policy at this time, that I think it very difficult to excuse their conduct in these two instances — that

“eyes? Kings have this peculiarity, that they have some kind of “sentiments against their own children, who are born lawful heirs to “succeed them. How then is it likely I should stand affected towards “my kinswoman, if she be once declared my heir? Just as Charles “the Seventh was toward Louis the Eleventh. Besides, and that “which weighs most with me, I know the inconstancy of this people; “I know how they loathe the present state of things; I know how “intent their eyes are upon a successor. It is natural for all men, as “the proverb is, to worship the rising rather than the setting sun. I “have learnt that from my own times, to omit other examples: when “my sister Mary sat at helm, how eagerly did some men desire to see “me placed on the throne!” &c. *English Version*, vol. ii. p. 158. ed. 1690.

\* See Somerville's *Queen Anne*, p. 111.; and Coxe's *Marlborough*, vol. ii. p. 240.



they may be charged with too little patriotism at the first period, or with too much party-spirit at the latter.

The application of Schutz, and the consequent indignation of the Queen, made her Ministers determine on strong remonstrances with the Court of Hanover. They appointed as ambassador, first Lord Paget, and almost immediately afterwards, the Earl of Clarendon—depending, perhaps, on his illustrious name, for of talents or of judgment he was certainly utterly destitute. We find it stated of him in a grave despatch, that when he was appointed governor of New York, and told that he should represent Her Majesty, he fancied that it was necessary to dress himself as a woman, and actually did so!\*. The Queen wrote to the Elector, and to Princess Sophia, with her own hand, on the 19th of May, deprecating, in the strongest terms, the proposed visit of the Prince, and holding out threats as to the consequences if he came. On the other hand, the Whig chiefs, and more especially the Duke of Marlborough, continued in their letters to be no less vehement in urging the necessity of his Highness's immediate arrival.†

It is difficult to say to what decision these opposite exhortations would have led, had not an unexpected incident postponed it. This was the sudden death—if, indeed, at eighty-three any death should be termed sudden—of the good old Princess Sophia. She had been much affected at reading the peremptory letters from the Queen; and on the next day after their receipt, the 28th of May, whilst walking in the gardens of Herrenhausen, she was seized with an apoplectic fit, and fell dead into the arms of the Electoral Princess, afterwards Queen

\* Bothmar's despatch to Robethon, June 16. 1714. Macpherson's Papers. This Lord Clarendon was Edward, the third Earl of the first creation; he died in 1723. In the despatch of Bothmar "the Indies," are named by mistake for New York; and Macpherson attempting to correct this error commits another by naming "Pennsylvania."

† "By this remedy," writes the Duke to Robethon, on the 5th of May, "the Succession will be secured without risk, without expense, and without war; and likewise it is very probable that France, seeing herself prevented in that manner, will abandon her design of assisting the Pretender . . . . In my humble opinion, it would be proper to use despatch, and that the Prince should set out before "Lord Paget arrives." Cadogan wrote still more pressingly from London on the 7th.



Caroline. She was a woman of most amiable temper and no mean acquirements, being perfect mistress of the Dutch, German, English, French, and Italian languages, and during her long life she had never belied the character that becomes an English and a Royal birth. She used to say that she should die happy if she could only live to have "Here lies Sophia, Queen of England," engraved upon her coffin; and it is remarkable within how very few weeks her wish would have been fulfilled.

The death of the Princess enabled the Elector, now become immediate heir to the English Crown, to steer his course without disobliging either the sovereign or his friends. After pausing for nearly three weeks, he answered the Queen's letter in most civil and submissive, but very vague terms; and despatched orders to Baron Bothmar, his envoy at the Hague, to proceed to London, and to consult with the Whig leaders, whether, after all the unavoidable delay that had occurred, any idea of sending over the Electoral Prince had not better be postponed till next Session.

Meanwhile the English Ministers were not inactive. Oxford, who had constantly endeavoured to keep well with the Court of Hanover—who perhaps really intended its interests—who had early in the year sent thither his cousin Mr. Harley with warm expressions of duty and attachment, saw, with despair, that the late events had confirmed the distrust and aversion in that quarter, whilst he had failed to push his negotiations with the other. His influence with the Queen was also daily declining, or, rather, had already ceased. In spite of all his whispers and manœuvres, Bolingbroke, in conjunction with Atterbury, perceiving how necessary it was to their ultimate designs still further to discourage, nay, even to crush the Dissenters, drew up in Council, and brought into Parliament, as a Government measure, the celebrated Schism Act. This act enjoins—That no person in Great Britain shall keep any public or private school, or act as tutor, that has not first subscribed the declaration to conform to the Church of England and obtained a licence from the Diocesan, and that upon failure of so doing the party may be committed to prison without bail; and that no such licence shall be granted before the party pro-

duces a certificate of his having received the Sacrament, according to the communion of the Church of England, within the last year, and also subscribed the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.

This tyrannical Act, introduced in the Commons on the 12th of May by Sir William Wyndham, was of course vehemently opposed by the Whigs. We know that Sir Peter King, Mr. Hampden, Sir Joseph Jekyll, and Robert Walpole spoke against it, although nothing beyond their names has been preserved on this occasion. But some observations of General Stanhope, which appear in the scanty reports of those debates, and which seem to have excited much attention, may perhaps be said, without undue praise, to be far in advance of the time at which they were delivered, and to show a large and enlightened toleration, which it was reserved for a much later generation to feel, acknowledge, and establish. We are told that he "showed, in particular, the ill consequences of "this law, as it would of course occasion foreign education, which, on the one hand, would drain the kingdom "of great sums of money, and, which was still worse, "would fill the tender minds of young men with prejudices against their own country. He illustrated and "strengthened his argument by the example of the English Popish seminaries abroad, which, he said, where "so pernicious to Great Britain, that, instead of making "new laws to encourage foreign education, he could wish "those already in force against Papists were mitigated, "and that they should be allowed a certain number of "schools."—It is singular that some of the most plain and simple notions, such as that of religious toleration, should be the slowest and most difficult to be impressed upon the human mind.

The Schism Act passed the Commons by a majority of 237 against 126. In the Lords, the second reading was moved by Bolingbroke\*, and ably opposed by Lords Cowper and Wharton. "It is somewhat strange," said

\* We have no account of Bolingbroke's speech on this occasion. In his letter to Wyndham he urges the best, perhaps the only argument that could be alleged on that side: "The evil effect is without remedy, and may therefore deserve indulgence; but the evil cause "is to be prevented, and can therefore be entitled to none."

the latter, "that they should call schism in England what "is the established religion in Scotland; and therefore if "the Lords, who represent the nobility of that part of "Great Britain, are for this Bill, I hope that, in order to "be even with us and consistent with themselves, they "will move for the bringing in another Bill to prevent "the growth of schism in their own country." Lord Halifax drew an animated contrast between the oppression now meditated on our own Protestant Dissenters and the protection and encouragement of the reformed Walloons by Queen Elizabeth, and of the French Huguenots by William the Third, when both fled hither from domestic persecution. Lord Townshend said that he had lived a long time in Holland, and had observed that the wealth and strength of that great and powerful Commonwealth lay in the number of its inhabitants; and, at the same time, he was persuaded that, if the States should cause the schools of any one sect tolerated in the United Provinces to be shut up, they would soon be as thin of people as Sweden or Spain. The Earl of Nottingham concluded an eloquent speech on the same side with a bitter and impressive allusion to Swift, whose favour with the Ministers was now firmly established and generally known. "My Lords," he said, "I have many children, and I "know not whether God Almighty will vouchsafe to let "me live to give them the education I could wish they "had. Therefore, my Lords, I own I tremble when I "think that a certain Divine, who is hardly suspected "of being a Christian, is in a fair way of being a Bishop, "and may one day give licences to those who shall be "intrusted with the education of youth!"\*

All parties looked with great interest to the conduct of the Lord Treasurer on this occasion. It was, as usual, in the highest degree irresolute and ambiguous. In the Cabinet, he proposed to soften the most rigorous clauses; in the House, he declared, that he "had not yet considered of it;" and having induced the Opposition to allow the second reading to pass without dividing, took

\* The Earl of Nottingham had previously been the object of some of Swift's fiercest attacks, and might no doubt entertain a personal resentment against him. See especially the ballad — "An orator "dismal of Nottinghamshire," &c. (Swift's Works, vol. x. p. 375.)

care to absent himself on the day when it finally came to the vote.\* Such vacillating weakness sealed his political ruin.

In Committee, the Opposition moved many important amendments and carried a few. First, they inserted a clause, that Dissenters might at least have schoolmistresses to teach their children to read. Next, they removed the conviction of offenders against the Act from the justices of the peace to the courts of law. A right of appeal was also provided; and a clause added, to exempt from the Act any tutor employed in a nobleman's family—it being, of course, impossible for a nobleman to entertain or to countenance any other than excellent principles!

On the other hand, the independent and Hanoverian Tory Peers, headed by Lord Anglesea, moved that the Act should extend to Ireland; a proposal which was combated by the Lord Lieutenant of that kingdom, but which, on a division, passed by a majority of six. On the third reading (June 10.), the whole Bill was carried by 77 against 72; thus proving that the ascendant of the Whig party in the House of Lords had been grievously shaken by the late creation; and that, when opposed to all the Hanoverian Tories, in addition to the Government, they had no longer the majority in their hands. A strong protest was entered against the Bill, and it deserves notice that this was signed by several of the Bishops.

When the Bill, thus amended, was sent to the Commons, a short debate ensued. Stanhope proposed, that the tutors in “the families of members of the House of Commons might be put upon the same footing as those “who taught in the families of noblemen; it being reasonable to suppose that the members of that House, “many of whom were of noble extraction, had as great “a concern as the Lords for the education of their children, and an equal right to take care of their instruction.” A very aristocratic argument for a popular privilege! Several members of both parties were of Stanhope's opinion; but Mr. Hungerford, backed by the Ministerial bench, represented that the least amendment

\* See Somerville's *Queen Anne*, p. 561.

now made might occasion the loss of the Bill; and, on a division, the one proposed was lost by 168 against 98. And thus was passed through both Houses one of the worst Acts that ever defiled the Statute Book. Happily for us, it never came into operation; for it so happened that the very day that had been fixed for its commencement was that on which the Queen expired. The Government which succeeded suspended its execution; and its repeal, as will afterwards be shown, was one of the acts of Lord Stanhope's administration.

At the time, however, the passing of this Bill appears to have flushed the Jacobites with the most eager hopes, insomuch as to draw them from their usual fenced and guarded caution in debate. One of them, Sir William Whitlocke, Member for the University of Oxford, speaking in the House of Commons of the Elector, said: "If he comes to the Crown, which I hope he never will—" Here there was a loud cry and confusion, the Whigs all calling out that Sir William should be brought to the Bar to answer for his words. But he, with great adroitness, eluded their attack, and repaired his own imprudence. He said he would retract nothing; he only meant that, as the Queen was younger than her heir presumptive, he hoped she would outlive him! \*

Some of the Jacobites, moreover, showed an inclination not to confine themselves to words. Two Irish officers were arrested, the one at Gravesend and the other at Deal, bearing passes from the Earl of Middleton, and enlisting men for the Pretender. Their detection was due to some secret information given to Lord Wharton, and to the legal steps he took in consequence; and the affair being not merely a national but a party one, made a great noise. Apprehensions were entertained that James, instead of trusting to the favourable disposition and broken health of the Queen, and awaiting her succession, might attempt to prosecute his claim by her dethronement—a blow which would have struck down the Tories in office as much as the Whigs in opposition, and which roused the dormant zeal of the former. Partly, therefore, to guard against this danger, and partly to lull the suspicions of their doubtful partisans, the Hanoverian Tories,

\* Lockhart, vol. i. p. 469.



who, by joining the Whigs on some questions, had already produced such strong Addresses from the House of Lords, the Ministers, on the 23d of June, issued a proclamation for apprehending the Pretender whenever he should attempt to land in Great Britain, and promising a reward of 5000*l.* for that service. Bolingbroke took an early opportunity of assuring the French agent that “in fact “this will make no difference” \*—nor can I think that it did. The measure was, however, received with great expressions of satisfaction in both Houses, and the Lower even passed a resolution for increasing the promised reward to 100,000*l.* A Bill was also rapidly passed, making it high treason to list or be enlisted in the Pretender’s service; and thus did Bolingbroke and his adherents endeavour to retain the mask which had already begun to drop, but which it was not yet expedient to cast aside. These were the last important proceedings of this Session, which was closed on the 9th of July by the Queen in person with a short and dissatisfied speech.

Meanwhile, the division amongst the Ministers and the murmurs of their partisans had been daily rising higher. A letter at this period from Swift to Lord Peterborough portrays the scene with his usual harsh dark colours†:—  
 “I was told the other day of an answer you made to  
 “somebody abroad who inquired of you the state and dis-  
 “positions of our Court,—that you could not tell, for you  
 “had been out of England a fortnight. . . . It appears  
 “you have a better opinion of our steadiness than we de-  
 “serve; for I do not remember, since you left us, that we  
 “have continued above four days in the same view, or  
 “four minutes with any manner of concert. . . . I never  
 “led a life so thoroughly uneasy as I do at present. Our  
 “situation is so bad, that our enemies could not, without  
 “abundance of invention and ability, have placed us so ill  
 “if we had left it entirely to their management. . . . .  
 “The height of honest men’s wishes at present is to rub  
 “on this Session, after which nobody has the impudence  
 “to expect that we shall not immediately fall to pieces;

\* Iberville to Torcy, July 2. 1714. Bolingbroke afterwards told Gaultier that the measure had been proposed in the Council by Oxford, and that he had not ventured to oppose it.

† Swift to Lord Peterborough, May 18. 1714, vol. xvi. p. 132.



"nor is any thing I write the least secret, even to a Whig footman. The Queen is pretty well at present; but the least disorder she has puts us all in alarm, and when it is over we act as if she were immortal. Neither is it possible to persuade people to make any preparation against an evil day. . . . . I am sure you would have prevented a great deal of ill if you had continued among us; but people of my level must be content to have their opinion asked, and to see it not followed."

Bolingbroke himself was no less loud in his complaints. "If my grooms," he says, "did not live a happier life than I have done this great while, I am sure they would quit my service."\* His breach with the Lord Treasurer, which had long been widening, was now open and avowed. Their common friend, Swift, made indeed another effort for their reconciliation, and induced them to meet at Lady Masham's, when he preached union to them warmly, but in vain. Finding his remonstrances fruitless, and unwilling to take part against either of his patrons, he declared that he would leave town, and cease his counsels. Bolingbroke whispered him, "You are in the right," whilst the Lord Treasurer said, as usual, "All will do well." Swift adhered to his intention, and retired into Berkshire, and with him departed the last hopes of Oxford.†

Another former friend of the Lord Treasurer had become not less active in striving for his downfall than she had been in promoting his power. Lady Masham, still the ruling favourite of the Queen, was now the close confederate of Bolingbroke and the Jacobites. In July, she was so far impelled by her resentment as to tell Oxford to his face, "You never did the Queen any service, nor are you capable of doing her any;" and what is more surprising, Oxford bore this taunt with silence and submission, and made no reply, and went to sup with her at her house the same evening!‡ Such meanness never yet averted a fall.

\* Letter to Swift, July 13. 1714.

† The best account of this celebrated quarrel is to be found in one of Swift's later letters to the second Lord Oxford, June 14. 1737. (Works, vol. xix. p. 158.) There is some thing very mournful and affecting in the tone of those recollections of his friends.

‡ Erasmus Lewis to Swift, July 17. 1714. Oxford had refused the

What had Oxford to oppose to these bedchamber intrigues? Nothing. His own artifices had become too refined for success, and too frequent for concealment. His character was understood. His popularity was gone. His support, or, at least, connivance, of the Schism Act, had alienated his remaining friends amongst the Puritans. Nay, even the public favour and high expectations with which he entered office, had, from their re-action, turned against him. The multitude seldom fails to expect impossibilities from a favourite statesman; such, for instance, as that he should increase the revenue by repealing taxes; and, therefore, no test of popularity is half so severe as power.

We also find it positively asserted by Marshal Berwick, in his *Memoirs*, that the Court of St. Germain's had intimated to the Queen, through the channel of the Duke of Ormond and of Lady Masham, its wish to see the Lord Treasurer removed.\* It is the more likely that Ormond was employed in this communication, since it appears that, in the preceding April, he had offered to receive a letter from the Pretender to the Queen, and to put it into the hands of Her Majesty, which Oxford had always declined to do.† Thus, then, all the pillars which had hitherto upheld his tottering authority were sapped and subverted, and on the 27th of July came the long-expected crisis of his fall. Her Majesty had that afternoon detailed to the other members of the Council some of the grounds of her displeasure with Oxford; and it is remarkable, that even his confidant and creature Erasmus Lewis appears to admit their just foundation.‡ After a

lady a job of some money out of the *Asiento* contract; of course after that he "could do no service to the Queen!"

\* *Mem.* vol. ii. p. 133. A little before this time (June 9.) Oxford had addressed a long letter to the Queen, which was printed in the report of the Committee of Secrecy next year. It is artful and submissive, but seems to have produced no effect.

† Gaultier to Torcy, April 25. 1714.

‡ "The Queen has told all the Lords the reasons of her parting with him (Oxford), namely: That he neglected all business; that he was very seldom to be understood; that when he did explain himself she could not depend upon the truth of what he said; that he never came to her at the time she appointed; that he often came drunk; lastly, to crown all, that he behaved himself towards her

personal altercation, carried on in the Queen's presence, and continued till two in the morning, Anne resumed the White Staff; and the whole power of the State with the choice of the new administration were left in the hands of Bolingbroke.

The first step of the new Prime Minister was an attempt to cajole his political opponents. On the very day after Oxford's dismissal, he entertained at dinner, at his house in Golden Square, Stanhope, Walpole, Pulteney, Craggs, and the other most eminent Whig members of the House of Commons\*; but he altogether failed either to conciliate or delude them. The Whigs positively required, as a security for the Protestant Succession, that the Pretender should be removed from Lorraine; whilst Bolingbroke confessed that such a banishment of her brother would never be sanctioned by the Queen. It is difficult to conceive how Bolingbroke could possibly have anticipated any other issue to these overtures than disappointment; and they are the more surprising, since, on the same day, he had an interview with the chief agent of France and the Pretender, whom he assured of his undiminished regard †, and since he was, in fact, steadily proceeding to the formation of a purely Jacobite administration. His projected arrangements were as follows: The Seals of Secretary, and the sole management of Foreign Affairs, were to remain with himself; whilst, to prevent his being overshadowed by any new Lord Treasurer, that department was to be put into commission, with Sir William Wyndham at its head. The Privy Seal was to be transferred to Atterbury; Bromley was to continue the other Secretary of State; and the Earl of Mar, the third for Scotland; the Duke of Ormond, Commander-in-Chief; the Duke of Buckingham, Lord President; and Lord Harcourt, Chancellor. To fill up the other inferior

"with bad manners, indecency, and disrespect. — *Pudet hæc opprobria nobis, &c.* I am distracted with the thoughts of this and the "pride of the conqueror." To Swift, July 27. 1714.

\* Political State, Aug. 1714, p. 83.

† "Il m'a assuré qu'il était dans les mêmes sentimens à l'égard "de Montgoulin (the Pretender) pourvu qu'il prit les mesures qui "conviendraient aux honnêtes gens du pays." Gaultier to Torcy, Aug. 7. 1714, N. S.

appointments was considered a matter of great difficulty, there being very few whom Bolingbroke thought sufficiently able to be useful, or sufficiently zealous to be trusted.\* But the Cabinet he intended (for it was never nominated), consisting, as it did, of scarcely any but Jacobites, and comprising not a few who afterwards openly attached themselves to the Pretender, and were attainted of high treason, can leave no doubt as to his ultimate design, and must convince us that, had the Queen lived only three months longer, our religion and liberties would have been exposed to most imminent peril.

In the midst of his triumph, the new Prime Minister found his exultation dashed with alarms at the approaching re-appearance of Marlborough on the political scene. That illustrious man had early in the spring determined to return to England so soon as the Session should be closed, and was already at Ostend, awaiting a favourable wind. His motives for coming over at this period have been often canvassed, but never very clearly explained. On the one hand, we find, from the despatches of the Hanoverian agents, that his journey had not been undertaken in concert with them.† On the other hand, the common rumour of his secret cabals and intended junction with Bolingbroke is utterly disproved by the evidence of Bolingbroke himself, who, in his most private correspondence, expresses his apprehensions at this journey, and hints that it proceeded from some intrigues of Lord Oxford.‡ How far may we believe this latter suspicion

\* "The sterility of good and able men is incredible." Erasmus Lewis to Swift, July 27. 1714.

† Bothmar to Robethon, July 16. O. S. 1714. "It is surprising that the Duke of Marlborough comes over at such a crisis, and does not rather wait until it is seen which of the two competitors will carry it with the Queen. Lord Sunderland himself does not understand this."

‡ "Lord Marlborough's people give out that he is coming over, and I take it for granted that he is so; whether on account of the ill figure he makes abroad, or the good one he hopes to make at home, I shall not determine. But I have reason to think that some people, who would rather move heaven and earth than either part with their power or make a right use of it, have lately made overtures to him, and have entered into some degree of concert with his creatures." To Lord Strafford, July 14. 1714.

to be truly founded? It is certain that, at the close of 1713, Oxford had written to the Duke in most flattering terms, and obtained a grant of 10,000*l.* to carry on the works at Blenheim. It is no less certain, however, that the confidential letters of the Duchess, during June and July, 1714, speak of Oxford with undiminished aversion.\* On the whole, I am inclined to think that Marlborough had had some private communication with the Lord Treasurer, but had not committed himself in any even the slightest degree; that he was returning to England to see and judge for himself of the prospect of affairs; and that he did not feel himself so far pledged to his former colleagues as to be entirely debarred from any new political connection.

But a mightier arm than even that of Marlborough was now stretched forth to arrest the evil designs of Bolingbroke. The days, nay, even the hours, of Queen Anne were numbered. Her Majesty's spirits had been so much agitated by the altercation in her presence, on the night of the 27th, as greatly to affect her health; and she herself said to one of her physicians, with that instinct of approaching dissolution so often and so strangely found before any danger is apparent, that she should not outlive it. The imposthume in her leg being checked, her gouty humour flew to her brain; she was seized with an apoplectic fit early in the morning of Friday the 30th, and immediately sank into a hopeless state of stupefaction. It may easily be supposed what various emotions such an event at such a crisis would occasion; yet it is a very remarkable proof of the bad opinion commonly entertained of Her Majesty's counsels, and of the revolutionary result anticipated from them, that the funds rose considerably on the first tidings of her danger, and fell again on a report of her recovery.†

Bolingbroke and the Jacobites, stunned and bewildered by this sudden crisis, were unable to mature their plans so rapidly as it required. The Whigs, on their part, were found much better prepared; having already, under the guidance of Stanhope, entered amongst themselves

\* See Coxe's *Life*, vol. vi. p. 299.

† See Swift's *Works*, vol. vi. p. 457.



into an organised association, collected arms and ammunition, and nominated officers. They had in readiness several thousand figures of a small fusée in brass, and some few in silver and gold, to be distributed amongst the most zealous followers and the most active chiefs, as signals in the expected day of trial.\* Stanhope was now taking every measure for acting with vigour, if necessary, on the demise of the Queen—to seize the Tower, to secure in it the persons of the leading Jacobites, to obtain possession of the outposts, and to proclaim the new King. Most anxious eyes were also cast upon the coasts of Dover, where the hero of the age and the idol of the army was daily expected from Ostend.

The genius of the Duke of Marlborough would no doubt have rendered any such struggle successful, but it was reserved for the Duke of Shrewsbury to avert its necessity. That eminent man—the only individual who mainly assisted in both the great changes of dynasty of 1688 and 1714—cast aside, at this crisis, his usual tergiversation and timidity, and evinced an honest zeal on behalf of “the good old cause.” His means, it is true, were still strongly marked with his characteristic duplicity. Whilst Bolingbroke appears to have fully confided in his attachment, he secretly concerted measures with two of the great Whig Peers, the Dukes of Argyle and Somerset. The result appeared on Friday the 30th. That morning the Council met at Kensington, it being then, as now, composed only of such councillors as had received a special summons, and the high officers alone were present. The news of the Queen's desperate condition had just been received. The Jacobites sat dispirited, but not hopeless, nor without resources. Suddenly the doors were thrown open, and Argyle and Somerset announced. They said that, understanding the danger of the Queen, they had hastened, though not specially summoned, to offer their assistance. In the pause of surprise which ensued, Shrewsbury rose and thanked them for their offer. They, immediately taking their seats, proposed an examination of the physicians; and on their report suggested that the post of Lord Treasurer

\* Lockhart's Comment., p. 463.



should be filled without delay, and that the Duke of Shrewsbury should be recommended to Her Majesty. What a scene for a painter! Shrewsbury, with his usual lofty air and impenetrable smoothness—the courtly smile, under which the fiery soul of St. John sought to veil its anguish and its rage—the slow, indecisive look of Ormond—and the haughty triumph of Argyle!

The Jacobite Ministers, thus taken completely by surprise, did not venture to offer any opposition to the recommendation of Shrewsbury; and accordingly a deputation, comprising Shrewsbury himself, waited upon Her Majesty the same morning, to lay before her what seemed the unanimous opinion of the Council. The Queen, who by this time had been roused to some degree of consciousness, faintly acquiesced, delivered the Treasurer's staff to Shrewsbury, and bade him use it for the good of her people. The Duke would have returned his staff as Chamberlain, but she desired him to keep them both; and thus, by a remarkable, and I believe unparalleled, combination, he was invested for some days with three of the highest offices of Court and State, being at once Lord Treasurer, Lord Chamberlain, and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. How strange to find all these dignities heaped upon a man who had so often professed his disinclination to public business—who had, during many years, harassed King William with applications to resign, and repeatedly entreated his friends to allow him to be “an insignificant cipher, instead of a bad figure!”\* “Had I a son,” he said on one occasion, “I would sooner breed him a cobbler than a courtier, and a hangman than a statesman!”†

Another proposal of the Dukes of Somerset and Argyle, which had passed at the morning meeting, was to send immediately a special summons to all Privy Councillors in or near London. Many of the Whigs accordingly attended the same afternoon, and, amongst them, the illustrious Somers, who, in spite of his growing infirmities, would not—for the first time in his life—be absent from the post of duty. His great name was in itself a

\* See his letter to Lord Halifax, August 24. 1705, in the Shrewsbury Correspondence.

† To Lord Somers, June 17. 1701.

tower of strength to his party; and the Council, with this new infusion of healthy blood in its veins, forthwith took vigorous measures to secure the legal order of succession. Four regiments were ordered to London, seven battalions recalled from Ostend, an embargo was laid on all the ports, and directions sent that a fleet should put out to sea.

The next day the Queen had sunk back into a lethargy, and the physicians gave no hopes of her life. The Council hereupon sent orders to the heralds-at-arms, and to a troop of the life-guards, to be in readiness to proclaim the successor. They sent express to Hanover Mr. Craggs, with a despatch to the Elector, earnestly requesting him to hasten to Holland, where a British squadron should attend him, and be ready to bring him over, in case of the Queen's demise. They also wrote to the States of Holland, reminding them of their guarantee to the Protestant Succession. They appointed Lord Berkeley to command the fleet. They ordered a reinforcement to proceed to Portsmouth, and an able general officer to Scotland; great importance being attached to the former, and much disaffection apprehended in the latter; and, in short, no precaution was neglected to insure tranquillity, or to check disturbances in any quarter where they might arise.

At seven the next morning, the 1st of August, the great event took place—the Queen expired! She had not recovered sufficient consciousness either to take the Sacrament or to sign her will. “The Earl of Oxford” was removed on Tuesday—the Queen died on Sunday! “What a world is this, and how does Fortune banter us!” says Bolingbroke.\*

\* Letter to Swift, Aug. 3. 1714. Iberville writes the day before to the King of France: “Milord Bolingbroke est pénétré de douleur . . . “Il m’a assuré que les mesures étaient si bien prises, qu’en six semaines de temps on aurait mis les choses en tel état qu’il n’y aurait “eu rien à craindre de ce qui vient d’arriver.”

## CHAPTER IV.

NEVER, perhaps, were the most reasonable calculations of judicious and reflecting men more thoroughly or more happily falsified than at the death of Queen Anne. Looking to the distracted state of parties in England—to the storm of disaffection ready to burst forth in Ireland and Scotland—remembering that the Hanover Succession would be discountenanced by all the Catholic Powers from religion, and by many of the Protestant from policy—that France, and Spain, and Italy, were as favourable to the Pretender as they dared—that the Emperor, from German jealousies of the Elector, was by no means desirous to see him on the British throne—that his claims would be promoted only by the exhausted republic of Holland, or the infant monarchy of Prussia—viewing, also, the genius of Bolingbroke and his ascendancy over the Queen—the demise of the latter could only be anticipated as a period of violent struggles and a doubtful victory. Yet the skilful interposition of Shrewsbury, and the prudent measures of the Council, completely warded off the expected conflict; and no son, with the most undisputed title, and in the most loyal times, ever succeeded his father with more apparent unanimity and quiet, than now a foreign and unknown prince was hailed as King of England.

We are, indeed, assured that Atterbury, immediately on the Queen's demise, proposed to Bolingbroke to attempt proclaiming James at Charing Cross; and offered himself to head the procession in his lawn sleeves. But Bolingbroke, shrinking from an enterprise so desperate, with the majority of the Council and the Executive Government against them, the Bishop is said to have exclaimed, with an oath, "There is the best cause in Europe lost for want of spirit!" With this exception, the Jacobites appear to have been utterly helpless and surprised; their real inferiority of numbers being now

most strikingly displayed. George the First was proclaimed in London, in York\*, and the other principal cities of England, amidst the loudest acclamations.

Previous to the proclamation, however, and immediately after Her Majesty's demise, the Council had met; and the Hanoverian resident, M. Kreyenberg, produced an instrument in the Elector's own writing†, nominating the persons who, as provided by the Regency Act, and in conjunction with the seven great officers of state, were to act as Lords Justices until the King's arrival. The list was found to contain the names of eighteen of the principal Peers, nearly all belonging to the Whig party; such as the Dukes of Shrewsbury, Somerset, and Argyle; Lords Cowper, Halifax, and Townshend. Two omissions, however, excited great surprise and displeasure: the most patriotic statesman and the most illustrious warrior of the age being passed over in Somers and Marlborough. The increasing infirmities of the former might, indeed, supply a pretext for his being omitted; yet, had they even made the nomination an empty compliment, it was one due and required by his character. The exclusion of Marlborough, and of his son-in-law Lord Sunderland, was commonly ascribed to a personal pique of the Elector against the former, who, during the campaign of 1708, had, in pursuance of his duty and of the public service, forborne to communicate any part of the plan of operations.‡ But it is probable that the real motive for the slight put upon these illustrious men was a jealousy of

\* An account of this ceremony is given by Lady Mary W. Montagu, in a letter to her husband from York (vol. ii. p. 137. ed. 1820): "I went to-day to see the King proclaimed, which was done, the Archbishop walking next the Lord Mayor, and all the country gentry following, with greater crowds of people than I believed to be in York; vast acclamations and the appearance of a general satisfaction; the Pretender afterwards dragged about the streets and burned; ringing of bells, bonfires and illuminations; the mob crying 'Liberty and Property!' and 'Long live King George!'. . . All the Protestants here seem unanimous for the Hanover Succession."

† There were two duplicates of this instrument; the one deposited with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other with the Lord Chancellor. See the Lords Justices' speech to Parliament, Aug. 5. 1714.

‡ Coxe's Life, vol. iv. p. 309.

great party leaders, an impression derived from Tory insinuations that they had attempted to dictate to Queen Anne, and a resolution to avoid a second "Junta."

It may easily be supposed what just resentment swelled in the bosom of Marlborough at the news of his unexpected exclusion. He had landed at Dover on the very day of the Queen's death. Proceeding to London, his public entry drew forth so warm a welcome from the people as more than atoned for the insult of his sovereign. It might truly be called a triumph—whether we consider the hero thus restored to his country, or the joyful festivities which greeted his return. Two hundred gentlemen on horseback, headed by Sir Charles Cox, member for Southwark, met him on the road; the procession was joined by a long train of carriages; and though his own broke down at Temple Bar, and he was obliged to enter another, the accident only gave fresh delight to the spectators, as serving to display his person to their view. He appeared in the House of Lords at its meeting, and took the oaths; but then, deeply chagrined at his exclusion, retired into the country until the arrival of the King.

The Lords Justices, having met, chose Addison their secretary, and ordered all despatches addressed to the Secretary of State to be brought to him. Thus Lord Bolingbroke, so lately supreme, found himself obliged to wait like some humble suitor at the door of the Council Chamber with his bag and papers, and to receive commands instead of giving them. One principal object of anxiety was Ireland, where it was feared that the Catholics might attempt a rising; and the Lords Justices at first had it in contemplation to send thither immediately, and without waiting for the King's sanction, Sunderland as Lord Lieutenant, and Stanhope as Commander-in-Chief.\* But the unanimity and quiet which they saw around them allayed their apprehensions; and, in fact, the Lords Justices of Ireland (the Archbishop of Armagh, and Sir Constantine Phipps) peaceably proclaimed King George on the 6th of August; nay, more, in vindication of their suspected zeal, issued a proclamation for disarming

\* Despatch from Bothmar to Robethon, Aug. 3. 1714. Macpherson's State Papers.

Papists and seizing their horses. At Edinburgh, also, the same ceremony took place without opposition.

According to the provisions of the Act of Regency, Parliament met on Sunday, the day of the Queen's demise. Secretary Bromley moved, That the Commons should adjourn to the Wednesday following, the Speaker being in Wales; but Sir Richard Onslow replied that the occasion was too critical, and time too precious for any to be wasted; and it was carried that the House should adjourn only to the next day. The three following days were occupied in taking the oaths. On the 5th the Lords Justices came down to the House of Peers; and the Lord Chancellor, in their name, delivered a speech, announcing their authority; observing, that as several branches of the revenue had expired with the Queen, they recommended to the Commons to provide anew for the dignity and honour of the Crown; and concluding: "We forbear laying before you anything that does not require your immediate consideration, not having received His Majesty's pleasure. We shall only exhort you, with the greatest earnestness, to a perfect unanimity, and a firm adherence to our Sovereign's interest, as being the only means to continue among us our present happy tranquillity." In pursuance of this intimation, loyal and dutiful Addresses to His Majesty were unanimously carried in both Houses, expressing, according to the motley combination of feelings which it is thought proper to profess on such occasions, their deep grief at "the death of our late sovereign lady Queen Anne, of blessed memory," and their lively pleasure at the accession of a monarch of such "princely virtues," and "undoubted right to the crown."\* Their next business was the settlement of his Civil List. The Tories, by rather too glaring a manoeuvre for favour at Court, proposed one million, which was more by 300,000*l.* than had been granted to Queen Anne. But the wisest of the King's friends perceived that such an augmentation would furnish grounds for

\* "We are as full in the House of Commons as at any time. We are gaping and staring to see who is to rule us. The Whigs think they shall engross all. We think we shall have our share." Erasmus Lewis to Swift, Aug. 7. 1714.



future complaints of Royal rapacity, proceeding, perhaps, from the very same party which had urged it. The proposal, therefore, though not openly opposed, was discouraged and dropped; and the sum of 700,000*l.* was voted. During the progress of the Bill, Horace Walpole, brother of Robert, moved, That the Committee should be instructed to insert a clause for the payment of the arrears due to the Hanover troops in the pay of England. These arrears, amounting to 65,022*l.*\*, had been withheld ever since July, 1712, when the troops in question, and several other regiments in English pay, had protested against the shameful secession of the Duke of Ormond, and indignantly left the English standards. To the Whigs this conduct appeared most public-spirited and praiseworthy, while the Tories held it forth as something hardly short of military desertion. The payment of the arrears had therefore long been a point of contention between the two parties, and only a very few weeks before had been negatived by a large majority in this same House of Commons.† But the accession of the sovereign of these troops to the throne of England proved to be a most conclusive argument, and effected many strange conversions; the motion of Horace Walpole was seconded by Sir William Wyndham, and was carried without opposition. Another clause, moved by Horace Walpole, for a reward of 100,000*l.* to be paid by the Treasury to any person apprehending the Pretender if he should attempt to land, passed also. Several other money bills having been carried received the Royal Assent by commission, and this short Session was closed by prorogation.

Nor was the Regency less prosperous and undisturbed in the foreign relations of the kingdom. The Court of France, confounded by the Queen's sudden death, and dreading any pretext for another war whilst their wounds from the last were still green, determined peaceably to acknowledge King George. A verbal assurance to this effect was first brought over by Lord Peterborough, who, with his usual activity, had hastened from France on the first news of the great event in England‡; and this was

\* See the items in the Commons' Journals, vol. xvii. p. 577.

† See Lockhart's Comment., p. 469.

‡ See Lord Stair's Diary in the Hardwicke State Papers, vol. ii. p. 528.

speedily followed and confirmed by a letter from Louis himself to the Lords Justices. The recognition of the Hanover Succession by this haughty monarch was considered, as it proved, an earnest that it would likewise be acknowledged by the other European powers. The first use made by the Lords Justices of the peaceable disposition of Louis is one that does them high honour, as tending to retrieve that of the country. They interceded in behalf of the unhappy Catalans, so infamously betrayed by the late administration, and now closely pressed by the combined forces of France and Spain. Prior received orders to make an application on this subject, while new instructions were sent out to Admiral Wishart in the Mediterranean, and a communication was entered into with one of the Catalan deputies in London. But it was already too late. The doom of that heroic people was sealed. The application of Prior was civilly declined, and a fresh and more peremptory one prevented by the storm and reduction of Barcelona on the fatal 11th of September.

During these transactions the eyes of all England were intently and anxiously directed to Hanover.

The new King was a man of more virtues than accomplishments. His private character—if, indeed, the character of a King can ever be called private—was upright, honourable, and benevolent. He was apt to remember services much longer than injuries—a quality rare in every rank of life, but least of all common with princes. He was steady in his friendships; even in his temper; sparing, and sometimes niggardly, in his expenses. This severe economy also extended to his time, which he distributed with the precision of a piece of machinery, and of which he devoted no small share to public business. A desire for peace was in him combined with tried valour and military knowledge, and he loved his people as much as he was capable of loving any thing. But, unhappily, his qualities, however solid, were not shining. A heavy countenance—an awkward address—an aversion to the pomp of majesty, nay even to the acclamations which greeted him, disgusted the multitude; while men of education were mortified at finding that he neither loved nor encouraged any branch of literature or science, nor any

one of the fine arts, except music. Politicians complained of his unbending obstinacy and contracted understanding. "His views and affections," says Lord Chesterfield, "were singly confined to the narrow compass of his Electorate; "England was too big for him." A diffidence of his own parts made him reluctant to speak in public, and select for his familiar society persons of inferior intellect and low buffoonery; nor did he ever show a proper dignity, either in his mind or manners.

It may seem absurd to reckon amongst the faults of this prince that he was already fifty-four years of age, attached to German customs, and utterly ignorant of the English language; yet there can be no doubt that these were the circumstances which most impeded his good government or extensive popularity. A hard fate that the enthronement of a stranger should have been the only means to secure our liberties and laws! Almost a century of foreign masters!—such has been the indirect but undoubted effect of the Great Rebellion. Charles and James, driven abroad by the tumults at home, received a French education, and pursued a French policy. Their government was overthrown by a Dutchman; George the First and George the Second were entirely German; and thus from 1660 to 1760, when a truly English monarch once more ascended the throne, the reign of Queen Anne appears the only exception to a foreign dominion.

Let not these observations mislead the reader as to my opinion of that crisis. Far from me be any feeling of aversion, or even of indifference, to the Hanover Succession! On the enthronement of that family depended, I most firmly believe, the security of our laws, of our properties, of our religion, of every thing that we either cherish or revere. In spite of every drawback, the cause of Hanover was undoubtedly the cause of liberty, and the cause of the Stuarts the cause of despotism. These two adverse principles will be found in almost all ages, and under every variety of parties, to carry on their fierce and unceasing warfare; the bright spirit is constantly struggling against the malevolent fiend. But let it be observed, that amongst all the masks which the hateful demon of despotism knows how to assume, none is more

dangerous and ensnaring than when it puts on the disguise of revolutionary licence — when it combats its rival with his own weapons, and seems only to aim at a greater extension of liberty. Thus are the friends of constitutional and settled freedom (unassailable on all other points) too often taken in the rear and overpowered. Can it be doubted, for example, that in France, in 1791, when the struggle lay between the Gironde, or partisans of the new limited and representative monarchy, and the Montagne, or the clamourers for further democratic changes, the cause of liberty was really with the former, and the cause of despotism with the latter? Would not the former, by their success, have maintained a constitutional freedom? Did not the latter, by prevailing, only conduct the nation through the dismal road of anarchy to its inevitable termination — a military despotism? To trace these two principles at work, and to assign to each its proper side at different periods, is one of the most curious and most instructive tasks in history.

The Earl of Clarendon, the ambassador from Queen Anne, had reached Hanover on the 16th of July, and a few days afterwards had his first audience at the country palace of Herrenhausen. The Elector was profuse in his expressions of attachment and gratitude to Her Majesty, disclaimed all intention of displeasing her, and imputed the application of Schutz entirely to Princess Sophia.\* But on the 5th of August arrived Mr. Craggs, with an account of the Queen's dangerous illness; and the same night three expresses — one to Lord Clarendon, and two to the Elector — brought the news of her death. George received the intelligence with composure and moderation. He immediately summoned his Ministers. He determined to entrust the government of his German dominions to a Council, with his brother, Prince Ernest, at its head; that his eldest son (afterwards George the Second) should

\* Despatches from Lord Clarendon to Secretary Bromley, published by Cox. "When," says Lord Clarendon, "I came to mention Schutz's demand, the Elector said these words: "J'espère que la Reine n'a pas cru que cela s'est fait par mon ordre; je vous assure que cela a été fait à mon insu; la défunte Electrice avait écrit à Schutz sans que je l'aie su pour s'informer pourquoi le Prince n'avait pas eu son *writ*," &c.

accompany him to England; that the greater part of his family should follow a few weeks after; but that his young grandson, Prince Frederick, should remain at Hanover. No small testimony to his merit and good government was displayed in the extreme grief of the people at his approaching departure; and his exaltation could not console them for their loss. The King, as a parting gift, intimated to the magistrates that they might ask some favour from him; and, at their request, he took the excise off provisions, and released the insolvent debtors from prison.

The delay which took place in his departure—he did not set out till the 31st—has been ascribed to profound policy, and to the prudent wish of obtaining some further intelligence from England\*; but writers are too frequently unwilling to assign any common motive to any Royal action, and they forget that George the First was always deliberate and phlegmatic in his movements, and had many matters of business to settle in his Electorate. On his arrival at the Hague he received compliments from the States and foreign Ministers, and communications from his friends in England, and he finally matured his arrangements for the new administration. At length, at six o'clock on the evening of the 18th of September, the King and Prince landed at Greenwich, where a vast concourse of the principal nobility and gentry had hastened to welcome their arrival. George showed very flattering attention to the leading Whigs, such as Marlborough, Sunderland, and Somers, but took no notice whatever of Ormond or Harcourt; and it was after many difficulties, and in total silence, that Oxford was admitted the next morning to the honour of kissing his hand.

Even before His Majesty's landing, he had, in some degree, disclosed his political intentions by sending directions to remove Bolingbroke from his office of Secretary of State, and to appoint in his place Lord Townshend. This order was executed on the last of August with strong marks of displeasure against the fallen Minister; Shrewsbury, Somerset, and Cowper taking the Seals from him, and locking the doors of his office. The bitter mor-

\* Coxe's *Memoirs of Walpole*, vol. i. p. 60.



tification of Bolingbroke pierces through the thin veil of his philosophy, as he writes to Atterbury:—"To be removed was neither matter of surprise nor of concern to me. But the manner of my removal shocked me for at least two minutes. . . . I am not in the least intimidated from any consideration of the Whig malice and power: but the grief of my soul is this—I see plainly that the Tory party is gone."\*

The nomination of the new Ministry by the King was a full triumph to the Whigs. He showed, however, a jealousy of those veteran chiefs who, under the name of Junta, had formerly directed them, by giving his chief confidence to a man hitherto of much less weight amongst them—Lord Townshend, already appointed as Secretary of State, and now considered as Prime Minister. Stanhope was made the second Secretary, and the Duke of Montrose succeeded the Earl of Mar for Scotland. Walpole, at first, received only the subordinate appointment of Paymaster-General, and was excluded from the Cabinet; but, daily rising as a debater and financier, before many months, was found so useful in the House of Commons as to be highly promoted. The Duke of Shrewsbury, having resigned his offices of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Lord Treasurer, was succeeded in the former by Lord Sunderland; whilst the latter was put into commission, with Lord Halifax at its head. As further favours to Halifax, he was raised to an Earldom, and allowed to transmit to his nephew his lucrative sinecure of Auditor of the Exchequer. Lord Cowper became Lord Chancellor; the Earl of Wharton, Privy Seal; and the Earl of Nottingham, President of the Council. Mr. Pulteney was Secretary at War, and the Duke of Argyle Commander-in-Chief for Scotland. In Ireland, the Archbishop of Armagh and Sir Constantine Phipps were removed from the office of Justices, and the

\* Macpherson's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 651. In a previous letter, printed in Bolingbroke's own correspondence, he says, "I served the Queen to the last gasp as faithfully, as disinterestedly, as zealously, as if her life had been good for twenty years, and she had had twenty children to succeed her: . . . on the same principle will I serve the King if he employs me." To Lord Strafford, Aug. 13. 1714.



latter replaced as Chancellor by Mr. Brodrick. High posts in the Royal household were given to Somerset and Devonshire. The Privy Council was dissolved, and a new one formed, which, according to the higher ideas of the office at that time, consisted of only thirty-three members. The Cabinet Council was to comprise Nottingham, Sunderland (when in England), Somers\*, Halifax, Townshend, Stanhope, the Lord Chancellor, and Marlborough. The latter had been most earnestly entreated by the Duchess—even as she states, upon her knees,—not to accept of any employment in the new reign. She urged that the exploits he had achieved, and the wealth he had amassed, would render him of far more use to the Court than the Court could be to him; and that he ought never to put it in the power of any King to use him ill. It might have been expected that Marlborough would have yielded to the arguments of one to whom he once declared, “I do assure you, upon my soul, I had much rather the whole world should go wrong than that you should be uneasy.”† But the brilliant meshes of a Court are seldom spread in vain.‡ The Duke consented to resume his offices of Captain-General and Master of the Ordnance; and was, besides, gratified by appointments bestowed upon his three sons-in-law, Lord Godolphin, the Earl of Bridgewater, and the Duke of Montagu. He soon found himself, however, reduced to a mere shadow of his past authority; he was treated with much respect, but no sort of confidence; scarcely ever invited to the Cabinet, of which he nominally formed a part, and confined to the most ordinary routine of his official functions. We are told that, though Commander-in-Chief, he could not obtain even a lieutenancy for a friend; and that not unfrequently he requested Pulteney, the Secretary-at-War, to solicit in his place; and used to add, “Do not say it is for me; for “whatever I ask is sure to be refused!”

\* Lord Somers was at this time too infirm for any active office. A further pension of 2000*l.* a year was, however, granted him. See *Comm. Journ.* vol. xviii. p. 110.

† Letter to the Duchess, May 29. 1702.

‡ “La Cour,” says La Bruyère, “ne rend pas heureux, mais empêche de l’être ailleurs.”

Such neglect to such a hero may palliate, but cannot excuse, his hateful treachery. It appears from the Stuart Papers, that, whilst Marlborough continued, at least in name, Commander-in-Chief of the British Army, he sent a sum of money to France as a loan to the Pretender just before the rebellion of 1715, which this money, no doubt, assisted in raising !\*

The new Secretary of State, Charles Viscount Townshend, was born about the year 1676, of a very ancient family in Norfolk. His father, Sir Horatio Townshend, was, according to Clarendon, "a gentleman of the greatest interest and credit in that large county, of very worthy principles, and of a noble fortune, which he engaged very frankly in the King's cause."† On the Restoration, his zeal was rewarded by a peerage, and afterwards by the further rank of Viscount. Charles, the second Lord, on first taking his seat in the House of Lords, joined the Tory party; but his more matured conviction led him to act with the Whigs, and he especially attached himself to Somers. He did not, however, take any prominent part in politics until, in 1709, he was appointed joint plenipotentiary with Marlborough to treat of peace at Gertruydenberg, and in the same year ambassador to the States General. As such, he concluded with them the Barrier treaty; and the recommendation of Slingeland, Heinsius, and their other leading men, proved afterwards of no small service to him with George the First. Returning home, on the expulsion of the Whigs from office, he continued to support them in Parliament; and drew still closer the personal friendship and county connection, which already united him to Walpole, by a marriage with his sister. Few men, perhaps, ever deserved or obtained a higher reputation for integrity; and it is no small proof of the general opinion, that, though he so decidedly forsook his first political connection, he was never exposed to any taunt of base or interested motives. His mind was frank and open; his intentions generous and honourable. To both his wives he was a most kind husband; to all his children a most

\* Lord Bolingbroke to the Pretender, Sept. 25. 1715, Stuart Papers. See Appendix.

† History of the Rebellion, vol. vii. p. 322. ed. Oxford, 1826.

affectionate father; and to his servants a benevolent master: "sure tests of real good nature," adds Lord Chesterfield; "for no man can long together simulate or "dissimulate at home." Unfortunately, this amiable disposition was joined with a manner coarse and rough, even to brutality. He was imperious and overbearing, impatient of contradiction, and extremely tenacious of preconceived opinions. On one occasion we find him candidly own that he knew himself to be "extremely "warm."\* From this disposition, combined with the influence of Walpole over him, he was at one period betrayed into a very reckless and unjustifiable course of opposition; and the same temper sometimes led him to opinions, or, at least, to expressions, ill suited to a constitutional monarchy. "His Lordship," writes his private secretary, in 1716, "thinks it the great misfortune of this "government that our Kings cannot always act up to "what they judge right, but must be often obliged to "have regard to the humour of their subjects."† Assiduity and experience, rather than natural parts, had made him an excellent man of business. As an orator, he was confused and ungraceful in his delivery; but commanding respect by his thorough knowledge of the subject, and always speaking to the point. As a Minister, it may truly be asserted that none ever entered Downing Street with a more honest heart, or left it with cleaner hands.

The second Secretary of State, James Stanhope — one of the very few subjects in modern times who have combined the direction of councils with the command of armies — was born at Paris‡, in 1673. He left the University of Oxford as a mere stripling, to accompany his father when sent as Envoy to Spain, soon after the Revolution. Yet in spite of this early interruption to his studies, he had already acquired some classical proficiency; the intervals of leisure which he afterwards snatched from active employments made him an accom-

\* Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 338.

† Mr. Poyntz to Secretary Stanhope, Aug. 17. 1716. Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 73.

‡ From his birth abroad, it became necessary to pass an Act for his naturalization in 1696. See Commons' Journals, vol. xi. p. 420, &c.

plished scholar; and we find him, in 1719, one of the most active and important years of his administration, engage the Abbé Vertot in a controversy on a very knotty point of ancient history, not without some application to modern times — the mode of election or inheritance of the Roman Senate. In 1691, taking leave of his father at Madrid, he embarked at Valencia for Italy, and in his way witnessed in Majorca the latest, I think, of the large public Autos de Fé.\* After a visit to Rome and Naples, he served for some time under the Duke of Savoy, and afterwards in the English regiment of Foot Guards, with which he joined the army in Flanders. His conduct at the siege of Namur in 1695 — when, though not on duty, he went as a volunteer to the attack of the castle, and supplied the place of the officers who fell around him, until he also sunk down disabled with a wound — attracted, in a high degree, the notice of King William, who desired that, young as he was, he should always have free access to his person; and gave him a company of foot, and soon afterwards a Colonel's commission. In the last Parliament of that Prince, he was elected member for Newport; in the first of Queen Anne, for Cockermouth; and a few months later, on the breaking out of the war of the Succession, he commanded the van-guard of the English who landed in the Bay of Cadiz, and acquired as much honour as that miserable expedition could admit. In the course of that war, he obtained at different times the rank of General, the command in chief of the British army in Spain, and the diplomatic post of Envoy-extraordinary to the Court of Charles. His skill and valour, signalised on many previous occasions, shone forth above all in the victories of Almenara and Zaragoza, but were not able to avert the

\* "I arrived here the 3d inst., and could get but very ill accommodations by reason of the concourse of people which are here at this time to assist at the Auto de Fé, which began last week; for Tuesday last there were burnt here twenty-seven Jews and heretics, and to-morrow I shall see executed above twenty more; and Tuesday next, if I stay here so long, is to be another *fiesta*, for so they entitle a day dedicated to so execrable an act. The greatest part of the criminals that are already and will be put to death were the richest men of the island, and owners of the best houses in this city." Letter to his father, Palma, May 5. 1691. MS.

disaster of Brihuega. That evil day closed his career as a soldier. But even during that career, ever since his election as a member of Parliament, he had taken a frequent and active part in politics — as might be done with far less difficulty at a period when an army regularly withdrew into winter quarters, and when its commanders might therefore be spared for the Parliamentary campaign. Thus, for example, in 1710, by far the most stirring and important year of his military life — the year of Almenara, Zaragoza, and Brihuega — he had, before leaving England in the spring, distinguished himself as one of the managers of Sacheverell's impeachment. In the same year, also, but during his absence, he was put in nomination for Westminster, together with Sir Henry Dutton Colt. They were decidedly the mob favourites\*; a circumstance which, at that period, did not either imply subserviency or insure success. The popular shouts at Westminster were not then reserved exclusively for despotic pledges; nor had it yet become usual for the electors to determine their choice according to the clamour of the non-electors. Accordingly, after a sharp struggle, the Whig candidates were here as elsewhere defeated by a large majority, and Stanhope could only fall back upon the burgage-tenures of Cockermouth.†

The General arrived from his Spanish captivity in August, 1712, to the great joy of the principal Whigs. "Your return," wrote Walpole to him, "is the only good effect that I ever hoped from our celebrated peace."‡ Even before his arrival in England, he had taken an opportunity of publicly showing his aversion for the treaty then in progress, by declining an introduction to Louis the Fourteenth, when offered by Lord Bolingbroke at Fontainebleau — a refusal then much noticed, and considered by the new administration as an insult to them-

\* Swift mentions in his *Journal to Stella*: "In the way we met the electors for Parliament-men, and the rabble came about our coach crying a Colt! a Stanhope! &c. We were afraid of a dead cat, or our glasses broken, and so were always of their side." October 5. 1710.

† See the *Memoirs of the Life of James Earl Stanhope*, London, 1721. I am not acquainted with the author's name; he is a warm panegyrist.

‡ Letter to General Stanhope, Houghton, Aug. 24. 1712. MS.



selves.\* Finding that he meant to keep no terms with them, their animosity led them to appoint some commissioners, at the head of whom was Shippen, to sift and examine all his payments of late years in Spain as Envoy-extraordinary or Commander-in-chief, and if possible to establish some charge against his character, or some claim upon his fortune. It was proved, however, from Stanhope's accounts and explanations†, that far from owing the Government any thing, he had left them his debtors; and I find it stated in his family papers, that he thereupon claimed and received this balance, which it had otherwise been his intention to relinquish. It is added, that soon afterwards meeting Shippen in the House of Commons, he walked up and thanked him for the pecuniary benefit he had thus derived from the hostility of the commission.

On his return from his captivity, Stanhope devoted himself wholly and eagerly to what had hitherto been only a divided pursuit; and he carried into politics the same qualities which had raised him in the field. He had always been distinguished as an officer of very great activity and personal exposure to danger—as one always foremost in his charges of cavalry—as one who would always rather cry “Come on” than “Go on” to his men; and in the council his energy and vehemence are recorded both by his enemies and friends. The “noble flame,” which yet lives in the immortal poetry of Pope‡, will be found admitted even in the sneer of Bolingbroke, that “Mr. Stanhope was not apt to despair, especially in “the execution of his own projects.”§ There were few men opposed to him in council who did not feel the force of his haughty and resolute spirit. But it appears that his ardour sometimes rose to violence, and betrayed him

\* See Tindal's History, vol. vi. p. 10. Lord Bolingbroke in his despatches does no more than drily notice Stanhope's arrival. To Lord Dartmouth, August 22. 1712.

† Stanhope's answer to the Commissioners was published early in 1714, as a tract. See also Boyer's Political State, 1713, 1715, &c.

‡ “Carleton's calm sense and Stanhope's noble flame  
“Compared, and knew their generous end the same.”

*Epilogue to Satires.*

§ Letters on History. Letter 8. vol. i. p. 225. ed. 1773.



into starts of passion and precipitate decisions; that he was by no means master of his temper, and often lost it in debate.\*

Another defect—it is nearly allied to the former—of Stanhope's political character, was too much openness. He was unwilling to conceal or disguise his plans and proceedings, as state necessity but too frequently requires. He used to say that, during his administration, he found that he always imposed upon the foreign ministers by merely telling them the naked truth; since they, suspecting some deep stratagem, and thinking such candour from a rival impossible, never failed to write to their respective Courts information directly contrary to the assurances he gave them.† But it is evident that such a scheme of policy cannot be long effectual, and is only an ingenious excuse for indiscretion. In this respect, as in most others, the character of Stanhope stands in most direct contrast to that of his predecessor, Harley, who carried his reserve and dissimulation to such an extent as most frequently to defeat itself, who, when he wished to be secret, only became mysterious, and raised curiosity instead of eluding observation.

Stanhope was, I believe, not unambitious of power; but, as to money, few statesmen have ever shown themselves more disinterested.‡ He left his son, as Lord Chesterfield once said of him in the House of Peers, "little else besides the honour of a seat amongst your "Lordships;" and of the landed possessions which his representative now enjoys, scarcely one fifth is derived from him. In his youth he is stated, and I believe truly §,

\* It may be observed, however, that Stanhope seldom showed this hastiness to foreigners, or in negotiations. The caustic St. Simon says of him, "*Il ne perdait point le sang-froid, rarement la politesse, avait beaucoup d'esprit, de genie, et de ressource.*" (Mem. vol. xviii. p. 339.)

† See some comments on this plan of Lord Stanhope by Lady M. W. Montagu (Letter to Lady Bute, March 6. 1753).

‡ For a remarkable instance—his reply to a munificent offer of the Emperor Charles VI.—I venture to refer to my War of the Succession, p. 177.

§ The authority of Cunningham, who had been personally disoblged by Stanhope, and who is seldom accurate on any subject, might be rejected. But we are told by the impartial St. Simon, "*Ce Général*

to have been licentious; even then, however, he was an assiduous and able man of business. Like most other distinguished generals, he, in the field, gradually acquired the talent how, on any sudden emergency, to pour forth very rapidly a variety of orders, each, apparently, unconnected with the last, yet each tending to the same point from a different quarter, and forming, when put together, a regular and uniform plan. His bodily activity was no less remarkable, and appeared in the great number of special missions he undertook, and of affairs he transacted at foreign capitals whilst holding the seals of office at home. All this, I firmly believe, is no more than strict justice requires me to say of him. Yet I cannot deny that, in drawing his character, or in estimating his abilities, I may, perhaps, be misled by my affectionate and grateful attachment to his memory. I may, perhaps, be too ready to adopt the panegyric of Steele, on his "plain-dealing, generosity, and frankness"—a natural and prevailing eloquence in assemblies—"an heroic and inspiring courage in the field—a gentle and winning behaviour in conversation." I may, perhaps, be partial in believing, as I do, that, had his life been longer spared—had not his career been cut short so soon after he had reached the heights of power and the age of forty-seven years—the world would not have been, what Steele proceeds to call it, "in arrear to his virtue;" and that he would be generally acknowledged as inferior to few other public characters in the history of his country. It is for the reader to reflect and to decide.

It remains for me to touch upon a circumstance connected with Stanhope's appointment as Secretary of State. Horace Walpole, Lord Orford, who numbered him amongst Sir Robert's enemies, and disliked him as such, says of him, in his *Reminiscences*—"Earl Stanhope was a man of strong and violent passions, and had dedicated himself to the army; and was so far from think-

"Anglais avait été fort debauché." (*Mem.* vol. vii. p. 293. ed. 1829.) As to Stanhope's maturer years, I find that in 1708, in a private correspondence between two other persons, his "strict morals" are commended. See the *Collection of Original Letters* published by Mr. T. Forster. London, 1830, p. 234.

"ing of any other line, that when Walpole, who first suggested the idea of appointing him Secretary of State, proposed it to him, he flew into a furious rage, and was on the point of a downright quarrel, looking on himself as totally unqualified for the post, and suspecting it a plan of mocking him."\* In conversation with Archdeacon Coxe, Lord Orford afterwards improved this story into Stanhope's putting his hand to his sword†; and, perhaps, had Lord Orford lived a little longer, it might have grown into a statement of Stanhope's actually stabbing Walpole. It relates to a period of which the narrator has just before, in his *Reminiscences*, had the unusual candour to own that he was "but superficially informed." The story is, moreover, in one of its circumstances, contradicted by a letter of the elder Horace Walpole, who states that it was he, and not his brother Robert, who first suggested the idea of appointing Stanhope Secretary of State.‡

But even were there no such circumstances to shake Lord Orford's testimony, it is, I conceive, fully disproved by the tenor of the Commons' proceedings in the Sessions of 1713 and 1714. All those who have perused them cannot fail to perceive that Stanhope had taken a very active and prominent part in them; and that none, not even I think Robert Walpole, at that time competed with him as a leader of the Opposition in that House. It is, therefore, as it seems to me, utterly incredible and absurd that so natural and common a result of Parliamentary distinction as the offer of a high civil appointment should have moved Stanhope into any expression of surprise or resentment.

But this is not all. So far from being unexpectedly raised by the favour of Walpole, it appears, on the contrary, that Stanhope, and not Walpole, was the Government leader of the House of Commons. In the contemporary writers, I find, it is true, no positive statement either to that or to the opposite effect. But I find that, in the first place, Stanhope held the high office of Se-

\* *Reminiscences*, Works, vol. iv. p. 287. ed. 1798.

† Coxe's *Memoirs of Walpole*, vol. i. p. 96.

‡ Letter to Etough, Sept. 21. 1752. printed in Coxe's second volume. Horace had been Stanhope's private secretary in Spain.

cretary of State, and Walpole only the subaltern post of Paymaster; so that it can hardly be supposed that the former was to be under the direction of the latter. I find, secondly, that in the Cabinet Council Walpole had no seat\*; and I would ask, whether there is a single instance of the House of Commons being led by any placeman not a Cabinet Minister? I find, thirdly, that in the ensuing Session, the King's messages were brought down by Stanhope, and not by Walpole.

I believe, therefore, that Stanhope was the Government leader at first. There is no doubt, however, that as time went on Walpole showed himself the more able debater; and, accordingly, as will be seen in the sequel, he was promoted to be First Lord of the Treasury in October, 1715.

It may be observed that, with the exception of Nottingham, who of late had always acted with the Whigs, not a single Tory was comprised in the new administration. Some modern writers have severely arraigned the policy of George in that respect. They have argued that he ought to have shown himself the King of the whole people, promoted the junction of both parties, instead of the triumph of one, and formed his government on broad and comprehensive principles. But was such an union really possible? Had not the Whigs and Tories too fiercely and too recently waged war to be so suddenly combined? If even an experienced native monarch might have shrunk from this attempt, would it not have overwhelmed a stranger to our language and manners? How ill had that experiment succeeded with William the Third, a prince so far more able and energetic than George! Would it have been prudent, while the storm of a Jacobite rebellion was gathering, to place at the helm any statesman of doubtful or wavering loyalty? For though, on the one hand, it would be most unjust to accuse the whole Tory party of Jacobite principles, it can as little be denied that many of its leaders secretly held them. Let us not, then, consider as the fault of George what was rather the misfortune of his times, nor fall into the common error of judging past events by the standard of present facts and present feelings.

\* Tindal, vol. vi. p. 318.

Meanwhile a great number of loyal addresses from the various cities and counties continued to pour in. The Ministerial arrangements were all completed before the Coronation, which took place on the 20th of October, and which, according to custom, was signalised by several promotions both in and to the Peerage. Few of the principal statesmen of the time, whether in or out of power, failed to attend the solemnity; both Oxford and Bolingbroke were present; and there were great demonstrations of joy throughout most parts of the kingdom. The day was, however, painfully marked in some places by riot and outrage, and other such tokens of public disapprobation, especially at Norwich, Bristol\*, and Birmingham, the latter being then remarkable for its high-church and monarchical principles. The University of Oxford also chose that day to confer unanimously, in full convocation, an honorary degree upon Sir Constantine Phipps, the late Jacobite Chancellor of Ireland.

Meanwhile the innocent cause of these unhappy divisions—the Pretender, or, as he was frequently called, the Chevalier de St. George—was still residing in Lorraine. On the first tidings that his sister was either dead or dying, he had immediately posted towards the Court of Versailles; but found it so fearful of allowing England any pretext for a rupture that it would not afford him the least countenance. M. de Torcy gave him a civil but positive injunction to quit the French dominions; and, finding his partisans in England benumbed and confounded, and making no effort in his favour, he returned whence he came, after one melancholy visit to the Queen Dowager at Chaillot. From Bar-le-Duc he soon afterwards proceeded to drink the waters of Plombières. There, on the 29th of August, New Style, he issued a manifesto, asserting his right to the Crown, and explaining the cause of his inactivity till “the death of the

\* The cry of the Bristol rioters was, “Sacheverell and Ormond! “Damn all foreign governments!” One house was plundered, and one man murdered. In November, seven of the ringleaders were brought to trial, and sentenced to fine and imprisonment; “but it “was thought surprising,” says a contemporary, “that not one of “them suffered capitally.” (Tindal, vol. vi. p. 341.) A curious contrast to the scenes of 1831.



“ Princess, our sister, of whose good intention towards us we could not for some time past well doubt.” When published in England, this incautious declaration produced an impression most unfavourable to the late administration, as unveiling their secret and disavowed, because defeated, designs in favour of the Jacobites. Their adherents at first insisted upon this document being a base contrivance of the Whigs to reflect upon the memory of the Queen and of her Tory government, but were much disconcerted at finding its authenticity acknowledged. However, they soon rallied sufficiently to be able to pour forth with some effect a host of libels, whose tendency we may easily discover from their titles: — “ Stand fast to the Church! — Where are the Bishops now? — The Religion of King George. — No Presbyterian Government. — The State Gamester; or, the Church of England’s Sorrowful Lamentation. — Æsop in Mourning. — The Duke of Ormond’s Vindication. — The Lord Bolingbroke’s Vindication. — No Lord Protector, or the Duke of Marlborough’s Design defeated!” The hawkers who cried these and other such pamphlets were sent to the house of correction by the Lord Mayor, with the approbation of Lord Townshend; and some antidotes to the poison were put forth on the other side.\*

On the day after the Coronation, Secretary Stanhope, and Sir Richard Temple, just created Lord Cobham, set out together on a secret mission to Vienna. It was of great importance to remove the jealousy and coldness

\* Addison, in one short piece (Frecholder, No. 14., Works, vol. iv. p. 384. ed. 1761) very humorously exposes the inconsistencies of the High Church Jacobites, by drawing out the articles of what he calls A Tory’s Creed. The three first are as follows: —

#### I.

That the Church of England will be always in danger till it has a Popish King for its defender.

#### II.

That for the safety of the Church no subject should be tolerated in any religion different from the Established, but that the head of our Church may be of that religion which is most repugnant to it.

#### III.

That the Protestant interest in this nation, and in all Europe, could not but flourish under the protection of one who thinks himself obliged, on pain of damnation, to do all that lies in his power for the extirpation of it.



with which the Emperor Charles the Sixth had seen the accession of the House of Hanover, and to allay his apprehensions as to any encroachments in Germany. Nor was it of less moment to induce the Imperial and the Dutch Governments to conclude the Barrier Treaty, which was still under discussion, and presenting an obstacle to any renewed alliance or cordial co-operation between them. Lord Cobham was intended as the permanent ambassador; but the personal appearance of Stanhope, in the first instance, was considered most desirable, from his having formerly been so closely linked with the Emperor in Spain—obtained so large a share of his regard and confidence—and, since that period, continued in correspondence with His Majesty. Stanhope went first to the Hague, where he had a conference with Pensionary Slingeland, Fagel, Hop, and other leading Dutch statesmen. He found them not unreasonable as to the articles of the Barrier Treaty, nor averse to the idea of a defensive alliance with the Emperor for their mutual security, but timidly shrinking from any public declaration or immediate measures. On the whole, they seemed much more afraid of personal responsibility than of national loss; and “it is my decided opinion,” adds Stanhope, “that if we do not help them to do their own business, it will never be done at all. There is not one amongst them who dares to take anything upon himself.” Proceeding to Vienna, Stanhope was most graciously received by Charles, and represented in strong terms to His Majesty, and to Prince Eugene, that a speedy conclusion of the Barrier Treaty was most necessary to arrest the further progress of French intrigues in Holland; that the public mind in that country was becoming soured; and that the possession of one town, or a few thousand florins, more or less, was not to be put in competition by the Emperor with the advantage of a sincere friendship and close alliance with the Dutch. But he met with unexpected difficulties. “I found,” he says, “Prince Eugene much irritated with the Dutch, and very indignant at their last proposals; insomuch that he declared he should never advise the Emperor to accept the Low Countries on such terms. The Low Countries, he observed, were of little value, either to

“the Emperor or to the empire; they were only a burden to the former; and, if he should consent to accept them, it would be much more for the sake of his old allies than for his own.”

The English Minister remained at Vienna during several weeks, endeavouring to overcome these obstacles. In his opinion, “the Emperor is much more moderate than most of his ministers. His views on the general system of European policy seem to me as just and reasonable as could possibly be expected; but all his Government is so exasperated against the Dutch, that I really cannot tell to what extremities they may not proceed.” Stanhope succeeded in lowering their pretensions as to several articles, but could not bring them to any positive and satisfactory adjustment. Setting out from Vienna on the 22d of December, New Style, he returned to confer with the statesmen at the Hague, and was again in England early in January.\* His embassy, though it failed in several of its objects, tended to facilitate the subsequent negotiations; and the Barrier Treaty, after a long and well-matched struggle between Dutch and German obstinacy, was, at length, brought to a conclusion, and signed in November, 1715. The States were to receive 500,000 crowns yearly, and to garrison Namur, Tournay, Menin, Furnes, Warneton, Ypres, and Knoque, together with Dendermond, jointly.†

Immediately after Stanhope's arrival, the Ministers, meeting in Council, determined to publish two Royal proclamations—the one dissolving the Parliament, the other calling a new one.‡ The terms of the latter gave

\* Secretary Stanhope to Lord Townshend, Nov. 6. 24. Dec. 5, &c. 1714.

† See Lamberty, vol. ix. p. 24., and Coxes House of Austria, vol. iii. p. 25.; but the former strangely omits Namur and Tournay as they stand in Dumont's collection. Coxe also is by no means accurate in this portion of his history; and his treaty of Westminster of May 5. 1715 is quite imaginary. I should conclude it to be a misprint for May 25. 1716, but that he goes on to speak of the change of policy produced by the death of Louis XIV., Sept. 1. 1715.

‡ A striking instance of blind and unreasonable party accusations is to be found in the Memoirs of Berwick, who charges the government of George the First, amongst other faults, with having “cassé le Parlement qui venait de le reconnaître si unanimement!” Yet

considerable, and, I think, very just offence. It severely reflected on the evil designs and miscarriages of the late Government, and advised the electors, in the choice of their representatives, to "have a particular regard to "such as showed a firmness to the Protestant Succession "when it was in danger." Such suggestions, however cautiously worded, are clearly unconstitutional: and appear least of all becoming in the mouth of a Prince so lately called over to protect our liberties and laws. Can it be doubted, also, that the Ministers, when using the name of Majesty, should have carefully avoided all approach to party violence and rancour?

The elections, however, went precisely as the framers of the proclamation could have wished.\* How strange and sudden are the veerings of popular favour! In the House of Commons, which sat at the beginning of 1710, the Whigs had a very great majority. The elections of that autumn, and of 1713, sent up as large a majority on the side of the Tories. Now, again in 1715, the Whigs found themselves lords of the public mind, and victorious in nearly all their contests. Some grounds have elsewhere been given that will partly account for these revulsions; but to explain them altogether on any thing like reason, or without a liberal allowance for the caprice of popular assemblies, would, I believe, be found as impracticable as to say why the wind should blow from the north to-day, and from the south to-morrow.

The Houses met on the 17th of March, when the Whigs, without opposition, raised Mr. Spencer Compton to the Speaker's chair. A few days afterwards, the King came down to open Parliament in person; but, being unable to pronounce English, gave his speech to be read by

the statutes 7 & 8 W. III. c. 15. and 6 Ann. c. 7. made it imperative that the Parliament should be dissolved within six months from the demise of the Crown. See *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 135., and *Blackstone's Comment.* vol. i. p. 188. ed. 1825.

\* There is a curious account of some slight disturbances at these elections in a contemporary pamphlet, "Account of the Riots and "Tumults, &c. ; printed for J. Baker, 1715." We are told that at Cambridge the under-graduates took an active part, and that "a "right trusty body of passively obedient *Johnians* were mounted on "their College leads, under which the members were to pass, with "good store of brick-bats to discharge on their heads!" (p. 20.)

the Chancellor. Its tone was frank and affectionate. He thanked all his loving subjects for their zeal and firmness in defence of his succession. He gently lamented the unsatisfactory terms of the peace, and the incomplete fulfilment of even those; and he ended with assurances that the established Constitution in Church and State should be the rule of his government, and the happiness of the people the chief care of his life.

The Addresses in answer to His Majesty's speech raised warm debates in both Houses. The Duke of Bolton having moved that of the Lords, in which there were the words "recover the reputation of this kingdom," Lord Bolingbroke, in a masterly harangue (it was his last in Parliament), vindicated the memory of the late Queen, and proposed to change the word "recover" into "maintain." The original Address was, however, carried against him by 66 to 33; and "I saw," he says, "to the shame of the Peerage, several Lords concur to condemn, in one general vote, all that they had approved of in a former Parliament by many particular Resolutions." It is remarkable that Lord Townshend did not speak at all on this occasion, and that the Duke of Shrewsbury took part against the Court.

In the Commons, the Address moved by Walpole contained even stronger expressions:—"It is with just resentment we observe that the Pretender still resides in Lorraine; and that he has the presumption, by declarations from thence, to stir up your Majesty's subjects to rebellion. But that which raises the utmost indignation of your Commons is, that it appears therein that his hopes were built upon the measures that had been taken for some time past in Great Britain. It shall be our business to trace out those measures whereon he placed his hopes, and to bring the authors of them to condign punishment." This was the first authentic announcement of the intention of the Ministers to call their predecessors to account, and it was confirmed by Secretary Stanhope in the course of the debate. A report, he said, had been industriously spread about that the present Ministers never designed to bring the late to trial, but only to censure them in general terms; but he could assure the House that, notwithstanding all t e

endeavours that had been used to prevent a discovery of the late mismanagement, by conveying away several papers from the Secretaries' offices, yet the Government had sufficient evidence left to prove the former Ministry the most corrupt that ever sat at the helm; that those matters would now be laid before the House; and that it would appear that a certain English General had acted in concert with, if not received orders from, Marshal Villars.

The Opposition made their stand upon another part of the Address, which, they said, reflected upon the memory of the late Queen; but this objection was dexterously parried by Walpole. Nothing, he declared, was further from their intentions than to asperse the late Queen: they rather designed to vindicate her memory by exposing and punishing those evil counsellors who deluded her into pernicious measures: whereas the opposite party endeavoured to screen and justify those counsellors, by throwing on that good, pious, and well-meaning Princess all the blame and odium of their evil counsels. On the division, the Government had 244 votes, and the Opposition 138.

It was evident, from the intimation of Stanhope, that if even the Duke of Ormond, the General alluded to, should be left untouched, at all events Oxford and Bolingbroke, the chiefs of the Cabinet which had framed his instructions, were to be singled out for trial and punishment. The two Ministers thus threatened pursued a very different course. Oxford, still guided by his naturally slow and phlegmatic temper—which, however unfit for action, can, in a defensive position, sometimes supply the place of wisdom, and, still more frequently, of dignity—determined calmly to await the storm.\* Bolingbroke, ever since his dismissal, had affected an unconcerned and confident demeanour; had appeared every where in public; had taken a part in debate; had, in conversation, descanted with his usual eloquence and insincerity on the pleasures of retirement. “I find by experience,” he used to say, “that I can be unfortunate without being

\* “He (Lord Oxford) has certainly made advances of civility to “the Whigs, which they have returned with the utmost contempt.” Mr. Ford to Swift, Aug. 14. 1714.



unhappy." The same tone was also adopted towards him by his friends, and thus, for example, by Swift: "I hope your Lordship, who was always so kind to me while you were a servant, will not forget me now in your greatness. I give you this caution, because I verily believe you will be apt to be exalted in your new station of retirement, which was the only honourable post that those who gave it you were capable of conferring."\* But though the language of the fallen Minister was that of innocence, his conduct was that of guilt. His heart began to fail him when he looked the danger more nearly in the face. He was informed—falsely, as it afterwards appeared—that Prior, who had been recalled from his post at Paris, and was just landed, had promised to disclose all he knew. He feared that his enemies would pursue him to the scaffold, he felt that he deserved it, and, in an evil hour for himself, he took the resolution of flying from England. According to his own account, moreover, so thorough was his abhorrence of Oxford, that the necessity of concerting measures with him for their common defence was a principal motive in deterring him from making any defence at all.† To conceal and secure his flight, he appeared at Drury Lane Theatre the evening before, the 26th of March; and, at the close of the performance, bespoke (according to the custom of the time) another play for the next night. Having then disguised himself as a servant to La Vigne, a messenger of the King of France, he set off to Dover, and embarked for Calais undiscovered. From thence he proceeded to Paris; and soon afterwards, as I shall have occasion to show, accepted the seals of Secretary of State from the Pretender.

The Duke of Ormond, at first, went into the opposite extreme; and, instead of running from the storm like

\* Swift to Bolingbroke, Sept. 14. 1714.

† See his letter to Sir William Wyndham. I should observe that this letter does not seem to have been published until after Bolingbroke's death. It was, I conceive, written about the time it purports to be (1717), privately printed, and circulated amongst a few persons. In 1744, Bolingbroke mentions his finding a copy of it while looking for other pamphlets (Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 343.), which appears to indicate that it had not been recently printed. Perhaps, however, it was circulated in MS.



Bolingbroke, or awaiting it like Oxford, attempted to meet and brave it. By the magnificence of his mode of living, and the public levees which he held, he seemed arrogantly vying with Royalty itself. He held a sort of Opposition Court at Richmond: he openly connected himself with the most ardent Jacobites: he showed no displeasure at finding his name coupled with "High Church" as the watchword of riots: he was known to foment those riots: he was proud to be the idol of the mob; and he became at length, as Bolingbroke observes, the bubble of his own popularity. Had he pursued a more moderate course, there is every reason to believe that he would never have been brought to trial. He was not responsible for the restraining orders as a statesman, and, as a soldier, it was his evident duty to obey them. Even without this apology, the Ministers would have shrunk from touching a man with so many friends in the country and in the House of Commons; and have feared that, however easily they might lop off the smaller branches, so great a bough could scarcely be hewed down.\*

On the 9th of April, Secretary Stanhope laid before the House all the instructions, memorials, and other papers relating to the late negotiation for peace and cessation of arms†; and, observing that they were too many and too voluminous to be perused by the whole House, he moved that they should be referred to a select Committee of twenty-one persons. No opposition was made to Stanhope's motion, and the Committee was selected by secret lists, which, from the temper of the majority, of course produced the appointment of the principal Whigs. The members met the same evening; chose Walpole for their chairman; and, during the next two months, pursued their investigation with all the

\* In Coxe's MSS. vol. xxxvi. Brit. Mus., is a letter from Mr. Cardonnel to the Duke of Marlborough, dated June 14. 1715, urging, "whether some means might not be found to bring over the Duke of Ormond to a sense of his error, and the owning his having been misled . . . It is not improbable the Ministry would choose to let him drop rather than bring on a prosecution against him."

† There were twelve volumes bound up, and three other "small books." Com. Journ. vol. xviii. p. 57.

activity of party zeal and personal resentment. It being a Committee of secrecy, we have no authentic record of their proceedings. Prior, however, who fell under their heavy displeasure for refusing to disclose his secrets, or criminate his employers, has given us an account of his examination, from which I shall make some extracts: —

“The most confused questions were put to me upon several heads, backward and forward, by Lechnere, and Boscawen, and Lord Coningsby; the two first of whom, I think, understood not one word of what they were saying. . . . Being asked of whom I received money in France? I answered, of M. Cantillon. ‘Was he not a Papist?’ said Boscawen. ‘Else, sir,’ I said, ‘he could not have been a banker at Paris, which he had been for several years before I knew him. In one word, he was the common banker to whom the English addressed themselves.’ Stanhope and Walpole I found frowning, and nodding at each other, and extremely ashamed of this vile stuff. . . . They proceeded in asking me to give an account of what, they said, I must needs know — the meeting of the Lords at my house, with Mesnager and Gaultier. I said, M. Mesnager had often been at my house; that the Secretary of State had seen him there; that I had eat and drank, and been abroad with him several times. They took great hold of this. Boscawen expressed himself with great joy, ‘This is more than we knew before!’ And from thence they ran wildly back — When I knew Gaultier? when I had been with Mesnager? I answered to this in as general terms as I could. . . . I was interrogated without method or connection, as any member of the Committee pleased; and, indeed, with confusion and disorder enough amongst themselves; for they sometimes stopped each other’s questions, and proposed new ones of their own. . . . Walpole and Stanhope grew mightily perplexed; the one in a sullen, the other in an unbounded, passion. Coningsby raved outright. . . . The Chairman told me that the Committee were not at all satisfied with my behaviour, nor could give such an account of it to the House as might merit their favour in my behalf; that, at present, they thought fit to lay me under a stricter confinement than

“that of my own house. Here Boscawen played the  
“moralist, and Coningsby the Christian, but both very  
“awkwardly. . . . . The messenger, to whose house they  
“intended to confine me, being called, Coningsby asked  
“him if his house was secured by bolts and bars. The  
“messenger answering in the negative, Coningsby very  
“angrily said, ‘Sir, you must secure this prisoner; it is  
“‘for the safety of the nation; if he escapes, you shall  
“‘answer for it.’” This picture is, no doubt, much too  
highly coloured, but as undoubtedly has many features of  
resemblance.\*

Before the report of the Secret Committee was prepared, there was scarcely a debate in the House of Commons, on whatever subject, that did not give rise to some outbreak of party violence, as in an inflamed state of body every humour festers. Thus, on one occasion, Sir William Wyndham having inveighed against the King’s proclamation in January, which he said was of dangerous consequence to the very being of Parliaments, he was fiercely called upon to explain these words, and, refusing, was assailed with the cry “To the Tower! To the Tower!” but Walpole, with much dexterity, averted any such unpopular act of rigour. “I am not,” he said, “for gratifying the desire which the member who occasions this great debate shows of being sent to the Tower. It would make him too considerable; and as he is a young man of good parts, who sets up for a warm champion of the late Ministry, and one who was in all their secrets, I would have him be in the house when we come to inquire into the conduct of his friends, both that he may have an opportunity to defend them, and be a witness of the fairness with which we shall proceed against those gentlemen, and that it may not be said that we take any advantage against them.” In compliance with this hint, Wyndham, instead of being committed to the Tower, was only ordered to be reprimanded by the Speaker.

\* See Prior’s account at length in the *Parl. Hist.* vol. vii. Appendix, No. 2. “It is certain,” says Dr. Birch, “Mr. Prior did prevaricate.” (*Tindal’s Hist.* vol. vi. p. 380.) I must observe that Prior’s examination did not take place until the 16th of June, after the report of the Committee.

On another occasion, when the Civil List was under discussion, Sir William Wyndham incautiously observed, that in the late Queen's time the sum of 500,000*l.* was sufficient for the support of her family and civil list, though she reserved 50,000*l.* a year for King James's consort. The Ministers joyfully pounced upon this unwary confession; and Stanhope rose to request the House to take notice of what that gentleman had advanced, because it would serve to confirm some matters which the Committee of Secrecy had found in the papers that were laid before them.\*

On June 1st, on a Bill for regulating the forces, Mr. Shippen, a leading Jacobite, having first thrown out the common-place charge against the administration of intending to set up a standing army, insinuated his belief that, after all the clamour that had been raised, their Secret Committee would end in smoke. This produced some most bitter invectives from the other side. Boscawen complained of "the insolence of a certain set of men;" and declared, that so far from ending in smoke, the Secret Committee were now ready to make their report. Walpole said that he "wanted words to express "the villany of the late Frenchified Ministry!" And Stanhope added, he "wondered that men who were guilty "of such enormous crimes had still the audaciousness to "appear in the public streets!" To such heights had party spirit risen!

At length, on the 9th of June, the long-expected report of the Committee, drawn up by Walpole, as the chairman, was read by him in the House of Commons. Its reading occupied five hours that day, and on the next was read a second time by the clerk at the table. It is a document of great clearness, perspicuity, and power; skilfully marshalling all the facts adverse to the late administration, and followed by an array of seventy-one extracts from their own correspondence, or other authentic documents, in confirmation of its charges. No one, I believe, could

\* Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 59. In the same debate, a member of the Opposition, whose name is not recorded, made some most malignant observations on an increase in the Judges' salaries, which had been made since His Majesty's accession, and which, he said, "was not for "services done, but expected."

peruse it without feeling his bosom burn with indignation at the base motives and shameful conditions of the Peace of Utrecht — above all, at the disgraceful line of conduct prescribed to Ormond at the suspension of arms — at the cold-blooded betrayal of the Catalans to Spain — at the wanton gift of Tournay to France — at the effrontery of Bolingbroke in attempting to pass upon the British people renunciations which the very parties who were to make them had privately owned to be invalid. Seldom has the avenging arm of offended justice laid bare a scene of such selfish disregard to public interests. In one point, however — the alleged intrigues of Bolingbroke and others of the Ministry with the Pretender — the report appears extremely weak and inconclusive. These intrigues are now, it is true, placed beyond all doubt by the subsequent avowal of some of the principal actors, or the disclosure of their most secret papers. But, at that period, nothing beyond circumstantial evidence or probable conjectures could be produced in support of this accusation; nor would it, therefore, have sufficed as the foundation for a charge of treason.

The reading of the report being concluded, Sir Thomas Hanmer moved, That its consideration should be postponed till the 21st; but this was warmly opposed by Stanhope and Walpole, and negatived by a large majority. Walpole then rose and impeached Bolingbroke of high treason. The friends of Bolingbroke in the House were not few, but his flight prevented their defence. A long silence ensued; and at length some timid expressions of dissent from Mr. Hungerford and General Ross were all that was heard in behalf of the lately triumphant leader of the Commons. The resolution having passed without a division, Lord Coningsby next stood up and said, “The worthy Chairman of the Committee has impeached the hand, but I do impeach the head; he has impeached the clerk, and I the justice; he has impeached the scholar, and I the master: I impeach Robert Earl of Oxford, and Earl Mortimer, of high treason and other high crimes and misdemeanors!”

This resolution also was carried without a division; but the impeachment of Ormond was a matter of much greater difficulty and debate. It was moved by Stanhope



on the 21st, and led to a discussion of nine hours and a half. Several undoubted friends of the Protestant Succession spoke in favour of the Duke; amongst others, Sir Joseph Jekyll, one of the Committee of Secrecy; and Ormond had so many partisans in the House, that the motion of Stanhope was passed by a majority of only forty-seven. Next day, Mr. Aislabie also impeached, not of high treason, but of high crimes and misdemeanors, the Earl of Strafford, as one of the two plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Utrecht\*; Mr. Hungerford sarcastically observing, that the Bishop of London, the other plenipotentiary, was, it seemed, to have the benefit of clergy!

It appears, however, that the zeal displayed in defence of Ormond inclined the Ministers to drop their proceedings against him, and the Duke of Devonshire had even taken measures to obtain for him a private audience of the King, in which any expressions of loyalty and promises of good conduct would probably have been accepted. Such a course was warmly pressed upon the Duke by his Jacobite confederates, who wished him to maintain his footing in England, and to lull the suspicions of the Government until their plans should be matured. Another scheme had also been framed for an immediate insurrection in the West; many measures having been concerted, and many engagements taken by Ormond himself for that object. But Ormond, who combined very honourable feelings with a very feeble resolution, could neither stoop to the dissimulation of the first project, nor rise to the energy of the second. He took, of all courses, the worst for himself and his party: he secretly fled to France. It has been said that, before he went, he paid a visit to Lord Oxford in the Tower, and advised him to attempt his escape;—that finding his arguments ineffectual, he took leave of him with the words, “Farewell, Oxford without a head!”—and that Oxford answered, “Farewell, Duke without a duchy!”

On the flight of Ormond, Acts of attainder against him and Bolingbroke were passed without difficulty, and

\* Coxe erroneously says that the impeachment of Strafford was moved by Stanhope. (*Life of Walpole*, p. 67.)



almost without opposition; but Ormond, unlike Bolingbroke, having thus taken his part, steadily adhered to it in evil fortune, and never returned to his native country. He was certainly a man of very amiable temper and no mean accomplishments, and with no blot upon his character—unless incapacity and utter want of vigour are to be looked upon as such. He died in 1745, at the age of fourscore. He is described by St. Simon, in his visit to Madrid in 1721, as short and fat in person, but yet of most graceful demeanour, and most noble aspect; remarkable for his attachment to the Church of England, and refusing large domains which were offered as the price of his conversion.\* Twenty-two years later we find the following account of him at Avignon, in the lively letters of Lady Mary Montagu:—"All the English, without distinction, see the Duke of Ormond. Lord Chesterfield, who, you know, is related to him, lay at his house during his stay in this town; and, to say truth, nobody can be more insignificant. He keeps an assembly where all the best company go twice in the week; lives here in great magnificence; is quite inoffensive; and seems to have forgotten every part of his past life, and to be of no party."†

Thus then, of the three Peers impeached of high treason, the Earl of Oxford remained alone. On the 9th of July, Lord Coningsby, followed by a great part of the House of Commons, brought up to the bar of the Lords sixteen articles of impeachment against him, to which six further ones were afterwards added. The first fifteen referred to the transactions of the Peace of Utrecht; but the sixteenth to the creation of twelve Peers in December, 1711, "by which the said Earl did most highly abuse the influence he then had with Her Majesty, and prevailed on her to exercise, in the most unprecedented and dangerous manner, that valuable and undoubted prerogative which the wisdom of the laws and constitution of this kingdom hath entrusted with the Crown for the rewarding signal virtue and distinguished merit; by which desperate advice he did not only, as far as in

\* *Mém. de St. Simon*, vol. xix. p. 441, ed. 1829.

† To Mr. Wortley, June 1. 1743.

“him lay, deprive Her Majesty of the continuance of those seasonable and wholesome counsels in that critical juncture, but wickedly perverted the true and only end of that great and useful prerogative, to the dishonour of the Crown, and irreparable mischief to the constitution of Parliaments.”

The impeachment being thus before the Lords, a debate arose in that House, whether any of the articles amounted to high treason; and it was proposed to consult the Judges: but a motion to that effect was lost by 84 votes against 52. On the next motion, that Oxford should be committed to the Tower, the Earl rose and addressed the House in a short speech—protesting his innocence, and most artfully insinuating that, in many of the acts imputed to him, he had only obeyed the positive orders of the Queen. This, in fact, seems to have been true with respect to the cessation of arms and the instructions to Ormond\*, and would have raised a question of most peculiar difficulty, at a period when the present doctrine of ministerial responsibility was still extremely loose and unsettled in the public mind. “My Lords,” said Oxford, in conclusion, “if Ministers of State, acting by the immediate commands of their Sovereign, are afterwards to be made accountable for their proceedings, it may, one day or other, be the case of all the members of this august assembly. . . . My Lords, I am now to take my leave of your Lordships, and of this honourable House, perhaps for ever. I shall lay down my life with pleasure in a cause favoured by my late dear Royal mistress; and when I consider that I am to be judged by the justice, honour, and virtue of my peers, I shall acquiesce and retire with great content. And, my Lords, God’s will be done!” In spite of this specious appeal, Lord Oxford, though reprieved for a few days from an indisposition, was committed to the Tower.

In considering these acts of Ministerial animosity with that calmness which, at such a distance of time, it requires no great effort to preserve, they appear to me most undoubtedly intemperate and unwise. On the guilt of the

\* See an anecdote in Lord Hardwicke’s State Papers, vol. ii. p. 482.

former administration, in transacting the Peace of Utrecht, I have already expressed no qualified opinion. But, in the first place, did that guilt amount to high treason? Waiving their intercourse with the Pretender, which there was not sufficient evidence to prove, the stress of the accusation for treason lay in their seeking to obtain Tournay for the French, which was construed to be within the Act of Edward the Third, an adhering to the Queen's enemies.\* Now, it must I think, be admitted, not only that this interpretation seems a straining of the Act, but that the motives of the Ministers, in the cession of Tournay, however culpable, were not precisely either treasonable or rebellious. So clear is this view of the subject, that above a year after the impeachment of Oxford, we find even the Cabinet Council—the same which had directed the impeachment—"of opinion that "the charge of high treason should be dropped, it being "very certain that there is not sufficient evidence to "convict him of that crime; but that he should be "pushed with all possible vigour, upon the point of "misdemeanor."† But further—it was surely no very safe or constitutional course (as was forcibly urged by Sir William Wyndham) to found charges of treason on

\* See Blackstone's Comment. vol. iv. p. 82. ed. 1825.

† Despatch from Lord Townshend to Secretary Stanhope, dated Nov. 2. 1716, and printed in Coxe's second volume of the Life of Walpole. The Archdeacon, when he refers to this passage in his first volume (p. 70.), draws an entirely erroneous inference from it as to the original accusation: "It is a justice due to Townshend and "Walpole to observe, that they strenuously insisted Oxford should not "be accused of high treason, but only tried for high crimes and misdemeanors." He previously (p. 68.), with the same view, descants upon "the approved humanity of such men as Townshend, Devonshire, Stanhope, and Walpole." Now, neither in the passage he alleges from the correspondence nor in any other, is there the slightest evidence that any one of these statesmen disapproved of the original accusations for treason, although in the course of the trial they all modified their views. As to Walpole, the only testimony (that of Bolingbroke, in his letter to Wyndham) speaks of him as the one who most warmly urged the original impeachments; but this statement appears just as vague and unsupported as that of Coxe upon the other side. The real truth seems to be, that Walpole, not being then a member of the Cabinet, had not much hand in either checking or urging these most impolitic measures.

the transactions of a peace which had already been approved by two successive Parliaments. Even if I could admit the justice of such impeachments, I should still utterly deny their policy. From the violence of party feeling, the King could not, it is true, at first, call any even of the moderate Tories to his counsels; but he ought, nevertheless, to have applied himself to allay that violence, and to detach those Tories from their banner, instead of making them cling closely together by the point of honour and exasperation which always spring from persecution. Was it not his interest to invite faithful services in future by a generous oblivion to the past? Was it not the duty of his Ministers to draw at least one advantage from his foreign birth, and keep his name clear from their own party rancour and resentment? That resentment might, no doubt, be justifiable: they had, when out of office, undergone much personal persecution from their triumphant rivals; they had to avenge the exile of Marlborough and the imprisonment of Walpole. But they ought to have remembered that the only mode by which such injustice could be excused in the eyes of posterity was by its retaliation; and that their headlong vengeance would incur the charge of supplying the fuel and stirring the flames of the smouldering civil war.

And all this, let us ask, for what? Was any thing gained, or could any thing be gained, by these impeachments? We may, perhaps, be told of the demands of justice against the late Ministers—of the necessity of deterring future ones from similar misconduct. But surely in this case, the failure of their misconduct, and their consequent exclusion from office, would have been sufficient as punishment for themselves or as warning to others. Unsuccessful guilt seldom makes imitators. Or if it be alleged that Bolingbroke or Oxford, by their popularity in the country, or the number of their friends in Parliament, might, perhaps, at some future time, overcome the Whigs and reinstate themselves in office—could there be a stronger argument to show the impolicy of assailing men so formidably backed, and of driving a large and formidable party to despair?

It is to be observed, however, that, in these impeach-

ments, the Ministers, so far from outrunning the wishes and demands of their own party, rather fell short of them. The language of some of their adherents was much stronger than their own. Thus, for instance, Lord Stanhope of Shelford, afterwards the celebrated Earl of Chesterfield, making his first speech on one of these occasions, said, "he never wished to spill the blood of any of his countrymen, much less the blood of any nobleman; but he was persuaded that the safety of his country required that examples should be made of those who had betrayed it in so infamous a manner." To this speech, Lord Chesterfield, in after-life, looked back with just regret. "Had I not been a young member," he observes, "I should certainly have been, as I own I deserved, reprimanded by the House for some strong and indiscreet things that I said."\*

Meanwhile, riots and outrages were increasing in several parts of the country. Staffordshire, above all, a county long remarkable for its Tory politics†, was the scene of disturbance. "High Church, and Ormond for ever!" was the cry. The mob, inflamed with zeal for their ecclesiastical establishment, and persuaded that its security would be very much promoted by pulling down Dissenters' meeting-houses, assembled in great numbers for that object. Many buildings were destroyed and many sectarians insulted. Against such proceedings it was thought requisite to point a sharper law; and recourse was had to the Riot Act—a statute passed in

\* Letter to his son, March 15. 1754. Dr. Maty says in his Life,—  
 "As soon as he had done speaking, one of the opposite party took him aside, and having complimented him upon his *coup d'essai*, observed that he was exactly acquainted with the date of his birth, and could prove that when he was chosen a member of the House he was not come of age, and that he was not so now; at the same time he assured him that he wished to take no advantage of this, unless his own friends were pushed, in which case, if he offered to vote, he would immediately acquaint the House with it. Lord Stanhope, who knew the consequences of this discovery, answered nothing; but making a low bow, quitted the House directly, and went to Paris!"

† Boswell observes in 1778: "I drank chocolate this morning with Mr. Eld, and, to my no small surprise, found him to be a Staffordshire Whig—a being which I did not believe had existed!" Life of Johnson, Croker's ed. vol. iv. p. 185.



the reign of Mary, and limited to the Queen's life; and, in like manner, enacted by Elizabeth, but never since revived. It was now made perpetual, and with increased powers. It provides, that if any twelve persons are unlawfully assembled to the disturbance of the peace, and any one Justice shall think proper to command them, by proclamation, to disperse; if they contemn his orders, and continue together for one hour afterwards, such contempt shall be felony without benefit of clergy. By a subsequent clause, the pulling down of chapels or houses even before the proclamation, is made subject to the same penalty.\* This Act, which still continues, though bearing a harsh and arbitrary aspect, has, I believe, in practice, never given rise to any deeds of oppression, nor well grounded causes of complaint.

From the great amount of public business, the Houses sat this year till the 21st of September. Even then—the rebellion, which I shall detail in the next chapter, being on the point of rising—Parliament was not prorogued, but only adjourned at short intervals, till it met again next year; so that what is called its first Session extends from March, 1715, till June, 1716.

This spring, died two of the Ministers; first, the Marquis of Wharton, Privy Seal, a man of great talents but profligate character, and succeeded by a son still more able, and still more abandoned than himself; secondly, Lord Halifax. No one had basked more largely in the sunshine of the new Court: he had received from its bounty an Earldom, the Garter, and the office of First Lord of the Treasury. Other men murmured at this rapid accumulation of favours. To himself, on the contrary, they all seemed inferior to his merit. He aimed at the great post of Lord Treasurer—a post never revived under the Georges; and, finding this withheld from him, did not scruple to enter into negotiations with his political opponents, and plot with them against his party and his principles. Happily for his reputation, these cabals were interrupted by his death. Halifax was justly renowned for the literary talents which he possessed himself and patronised in others; for his skill in finance;

\* Blackstone's Comment. vol. iv. p. 142. ed. 1825.



for his eloquence in debate ; for his activity in business. He was, however, better fitted—in his later years, at least—to adorn than to lead a party. Marlborough, in his private letters, has, with his usual admirable discrimination of characters, touched upon the weak point of this:—"I agree with you that Lord Halifax has no other principle but his ambition ; so that he would put "all in distraction rather than not gain his point." And again: "If he had no other fault but his unreasonable "vanity, that alone would be capable of making him "guilty of any fault."\*

On the demise of Wharton and Halifax, the Privy Seal was put into commission ; and the Earl of Carlisle, a respectable nobleman, with some taste but no talent for poetry †, was made First Lord of the Treasury. He was soon found, however, wholly unequal to that high office ; and it was, in October, 1715, transferred to Walpole as a just reward for the talents he had displayed during the last Session, and especially in the impeachments.

\* To the Duchess, February 7. 1709, and Nov. 28. 1708.

† His Lordship continued rhyming till a few hours before his death, in 1738 ; and "it is a pity," says Horace Walpole, "that such "wholesome precepts were not couched in more harmonious numbers." Royal and Noble Authors ; Works, vol. i. p. 534.

## CHAPTER V.

To those who attentively consider the state of parties at the accession of George the First, it will, I think, appear indisputable that the friends of the Pretender would, sooner or later, with more or with less resources, have attempted an insurrection in his cause. On the other hand, however, I am far from denying that this insurrection gathered strength from the vindictive measures of the Whig administration—measures which tended to exalt the hopes, and increase the numbers, of the disaffected.

To their success, however, three things seemed essential: first, that the rising in England should take place conjointly with that in Scotland; secondly, the personal presence of the Pretender whenever his standard was first raised; and, thirdly, some assistance from France. It will be my task to explain how, partly from misfortune, but more from mismanagement, not one of these objects, though reasonably expected, was attained.

Lord Bolingbroke on arriving at Paris, had by no means openly and at once attached himself to the Jacobite party. Still hoping for a favourable construction from his judges in England, he resolved not to provoke them by any fresh ground of accusation. He went to the Earl of Stair, the new British ambassador, and protested to him that he would enter into no disloyal engagements; and he wrote to Secretary Stanhope with similar assurances.

We learn, however, from the best authority, that Bolingbroke, with characteristic duplicity, at the very time that he made those professions to Lord Stair, and wrote thus to Stanhope, had a secret conference with Marshal Berwick, the Pretender's illegitimate brother; gave a flattering report of the Jacobite interest in England; and observed, that the time was not yet come for himself

to espouse it publicly.\* Having thus, as much as possible, made terms with both parties, the noble exile retired into Dauphiné, where he anxiously awaited the course of events. Here he soon received tidings of the Bill of Attainder passing against him, and felt, as he says, the smart of it tingling in every vein. His own inclination was seconded by letters from his friends; he saw that it was no longer necessary to keep measures with the House of Hanover, and hastening to Commercy in Lorraine, he publicly joined the exiled heir of the Stuarts.†

“The very first conversation I had with the Chevalier,” says Bolingbroke himself, “answered in no degree my expectations. He talked to me like a man who expected every moment to set out for England or Scotland, but did not very well know for which.”‡ He was in very active communication with both countries, as also with the Court of France. The letters from the Scotch were warm and eager; they declared themselves impatient to rise; they pressed for the Chevalier’s arrival amongst them, (sometimes, according to Bolingbroke, in terms much more zealous than respectful,) and seemed to apprehend no other danger than having the honour of the Restoration taken from them, or shared with others. From England, on the contrary, the advices were as loose and undetermined as might be expected from the character of the Duke of Ormond, who had taken upon himself the whole direction of the business in that country. He had received from James a commission, with the most ample powers that could be given; and he was in close correspondence with Berwick, the intended generalissimo of the Pretender’s armament. His reports on the state of public feeling were most favourable; he did not scruple to assert that, out of every ten persons, nine

\* *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 137.

† James, on his part, received Bolingbroke with great distinction, and soon afterwards sent him an Earl’s patent: “I cannot, you know,” he says, “as yet give you very essential proofs of my kindness, but the least I can do for so good and faithful a servant is in sending you the enclosed warrant, which raises you a degree higher than my sister had done before, and which will fix your rank with me beyond dispute.” July 25. 1715. *Stuart Papers*.

‡ Letter to Sir William Wyndham.

were against King George ; he had, moreover, he said, taken care to distribute money amongst the disbanded officers, to keep alive his influence with the army, and to foment the tumults of the people.\* But when from statements the Duke came to projects, he declared that he and his friends were unable or unwilling to stir, unless assisted by France with a body of at least three or four thousand troops, a sum of money, and a supply of arms and ammunition.

In answer to this application, the Ministers of Louis declared, in a frank and friendly spirit, that, for their own national interest, the maintenance of peace with England was indispensable ; that, therefore, no body of troops could possibly be sent, nor any ostensible assistance afforded, but that secret supplies of money, arms, and ammunition should not be withheld. Louis even prevailed upon the Court of Madrid to promise a loan of four hundred thousand crowns to the Chevalier, who, on his personal credit, had already been able to raise one hundred thousand, besides ten thousand stand of arms. Ormond and his friends were, therefore, under no false hopes. They were told plainly, and at once, that no foreign troops could be expected. It was for them next to consider whether or not they could act without such aid ; and, on either alternative, to state their intention plainly and distinctly. But Ormond was in war like Oxford in politics. Instead of taking either part, he wavered between both. Sometimes he renewed his request for troops—sometimes he urged the Pretender to embark immediately for England. Guided by resentment rather than by reason, his course shifted from day to day ; and he always felt most sure of subverting the Government, whenever he was most angry with it. Such hot and cold fits marred all attempts at regular design.

The evident policy of the Chevalier under these circumstances was to restrain the Scotch, and to quicken the English, so that both might ultimately act together, and to entangle the Court of France in hostilities against the Government of George. For all these objects, Paris appeared the best pivot for his negotiations ; and Boling-

\* See the *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 135.

broke, having accepted the Seals as his Secretary of State, repaired thither towards the end of July. "Here," he says, "I found a multitude of people at work, and every one doing what seemed good in his own eyes; no subordination, no order, no concert. . . . The Jacobites had wrought one another up to look on the success of the present designs as infallible. . . . Care and hope sat on every busy Irish face. Those who could write and read had letters to show, and those who had not yet arrived to this pitch of erudition had their secrets to whisper. No sex was excluded from this Ministry."\* With such a multitude of counsellors, and liberality of disclosures, it was not difficult for an acute and able Minister like Lord Stair to penetrate into all their "secrets"—as they were still by courtesy termed.

While Bolingbroke was striving to dispose and regulate this chaos of intrigue, he had the satisfaction to receive at length from England more distinct and positive instructions, in a memorial agreed upon between the Duke of Ormond, Lord Mar, Lord Lansdowne, and the other heads of the Jacobites. This paper again strongly urged the importance of a body of French troops, and the danger of coming without them. But, it added, if the Chevalier were determined to run that risk, he ought to set out so as not to land until the end of September, Old Style, by which time Parliament would in all probability be prorogued, and the influential Jacobite Peers and Members of the House of Commons have returned to their respective counties. In this case, it demanded that the Chevalier should bring with him 20,000 arms, a train of artillery, 500 officers, and a considerable sum of money; and when these should be in readiness, it promised to give him notice of the proper place for landing. This paper Bolingbroke immediately adopted as the compass for his course; and communicated part of it to the Ministers of Louis†, whom he found struggling between the most

\* Letter to Sir William Wyndham. His despatch to the Pretender, of July 23. 1715 (Appendix), is in a similar strain; and, in fact, the greater part of the statements in the Letter to Wyndham are very remarkably confirmed by the correspondence in the Stuart Papers.

† Bolingbroke to Torey, August, 1715. Stuart Papers. See Appendix.

friendly zeal for the Pretender and the fear of another war. To the request for troops, or for any open engagement, they were still steadily opposed; but they were willing to grant indirect supplies, and had already allowed a small armament to be fitted out at Havre, partly at their expense, and under a fictitious name. Thus they would probably have been drawn from step to step farther than they at first designed; the resentment of the Court of England and of the Whig administration would have blazed high; the Jacobites would then have secretly concurred with the Hanoverians in endeavouring to fix upon the Court of France the aid it had afforded; and, on the whole, Bolingbroke declares himself clearly of opinion, that, had Louis the Fourteenth lived six months longer, the war between France and England would have been renewed.

Thus, then, at this juncture the cause of the Stuarts seemed to bear a brighter aspect than it had assumed since the battle of the Boyne. But it was soon again overcast — first by the flight of Ormond, and, secondly, by the death of Louis. Ormond had promised, in his letters, to keep his ground to the last; to remain at Richmond, unless threatened with arrest; and in that case to hasten to the western counties, the chief seat of his influence, and there put himself at the head of his friends. With this view he had already concerted some measures for seizing the cities of Bristol, Exeter, and Plymouth; he had assigned stations to a great number of disbanded officers in his interest, and had even provided relays of horses on the road, to secure his rapid progress.\* But though personally a brave man, at the last moment his heart failed him. He slunk away and crossed over to France in a small sloop, without leaving any order whatever for those who had confided in his management, and were awaiting his directions. His arrival at Paris struck a great damp on the Jacobite cause. The French statesmen, who had heard his popularity so often and so loudly bragged of, and who had looked upon him as the main pillar of his party, now began, from the easy subversion of the first, to entertain no very favourable opinion of the latter.

\* *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 143.



The health of Louis the Fourteenth had for some time been declining. That sun, so bright in its meridian, so dim and clouded at its setting, was now soon to disappear.\* It would be a melancholy task to trace the changes in his fortunes and his character during sixty years—from his joyous and triumphant manhood to his cheerless and sullen old age. To be stripped of his hard-won conquests—to see the fabric of power, raised in fifty toilsome and victorious years, at last crumbled into dust—to hear the exulting acclamations which used to greet his presence transformed to indignant murmurs or mournful silence—to be deprived by a sudden and suspicious death of nearly all the princes of his race, and left with no other male descendant for his successor than an infant great-grandson—to be a prey to grasping bastards, and to the widow of a deformed buffoon; such was the fate reserved for the vaunted conqueror of Monst†, for the magnificent lord of Versailles! He died at last on the 1st of September in this year.‡ “He was,” says Bolingbroke, “the best friend the Chevalier had, and when I engaged in this business my principal dependence was on his personal character. . . . All I had to negotiate by myself first, and in conjunction with the Duke of Ormond afterwards, languished with the King. My hopes sunk as he declined, and died when he expired.”§

The new ruler of France, the Regent Duke of Orleans, having attained his authority in opposition to Madame de Maintenon, to the faction of the Bastards, and to the last advisers of Louis the Fourteenth, was of course inclined to very different counsels. Both the Ministers and

\* Louis had taken the sun for his device in 1662. Many years afterwards, a Calvinist caricature, in allusion to the power of Madame de Maintenon over him, represented him not unaptly as a sun peeping from behind a woman's hood. See the *Mémoires de Maurepas*, vol. iii. p. 329. ed. 1792.

†

“C'est Jupiter en personne

“Ou c'est le vainqueur de Mons!”

says Boileau in his triumphal ode on the taking of Namur.

‡ Voltaire tells us: “Le Comte de Stair paria selon le genie de sa nation que le Roi ne passerait pas le mois de Septembre!” *Siècle de Louis XIV.*; *Anecdotes*. A strange bet for an ambassador!

§ Letter to Sir William Wyndham. The same feeling is apparent in his letters to James in the *Stuart Papers*.

measures of the late Sovereign were immediately changed. The Regent could not, indeed, any more than Louis, entirely forsake the cause of an unfortunate kinsman — of one sprung, like himself, from the blood of the heroic Henri Quatre. He perceived, moreover, that should the Chevalier prevail in his enterprise, the Government of France could not fail to obtain, as it would deserve, great influence and ascendancy over the restored Government of England, and he was careful to put no obstacle in the way of such advantages. But he also perceived, that should the Jacobites be crushed and overpowered, he might derive no small accession of strength from a close alliance with the Ministers of George. He had, in fact, already, during the lifetime of Louis, entered into secret negotiations with them\*; and in this course he had peculiar facilities from his personal knowledge of the new Secretary of State, with whom he had lived on familiar terms in early life, and whom, during his Spanish campaigns, he had entrusted with some most delicate and confidential overtures.† On the whole, therefore, Lord Stair's representations were far more favourably heard than during the former reign; while Bolingbroke and Ormond, though by no means altogether repulsed, were much less warmly encouraged.

Bolingbroke continued for some time, however ineffectually, to ply the new French Government with his projects and demands. Ormond, on the contrary, hoped that he had found a shorter and surer channel to the Regent's favour in one Mrs. Olivia Trant, a lady much addicted to intrigues both of politics and love; but, unhappily, by no means so great a proficient in the first as in the latter. It was found very easy to entangle the Regent in the snares of beauty, but impossible to draw from him through those means any more effectual succour, or even any less cautious expressions.‡ The Duke

\* See the *Mém. de St. Simon*, vol. xiii. p. 396. ed. 1829; and Lord Stair's *Diary* in the *Hardwicke State Papers*, vol. ii. p. 533. and 541. It appears that the English Ministers went so far as to offer the Duke of Orleans assistance in troops and money, if requisite, to secure his regency. *Mém. de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 197.

† I venture to refer the reader to my *War of the Succession*, pp. 261—266.

‡ Ormond afterwards gives an account of a private interview he

of Orleans, in fact, was a man who deserves at least this praise—that amidst all his manifold amours he never allowed any of his mistresses any influence in business. Once, it is related of him, being anxiously and repeatedly urged by one of these fair politicians at a private interview, he at length led her before a mirror at one end of the apartment. “Look at those lovely lips,” he cried, “and own yourself that they were not made for state affairs!”\*

It was in the midst of these useless negotiations that Admiral Sir George Byng came into the road of Havre with a squadron, and that Lord Stair positively demanded that certain ships, which he designated by name, and which he truly alleged to be equipped for the Pretender, should be given up by the French Government. Thus pressed, the Regent did not, indeed, comply with the requisition or surrender the ships, but he ordered them to be unloaded, and the arms which they conveyed to be deposited in the King’s magazines.† Such was the early blight that fell on the Pretender’s only armament; and thus, too, it became apparent that little assistance from the Continent, beyond the encouragement of his personal presence, was any longer to be looked for.

Under these circumstances Bolingbroke despatched an agent to London, with a message to Lord Mar—that he understood it to be his Lordship’s opinion that Scotland could do nothing effectual without England—that England would not stir without assistance from abroad—and that no assistance from abroad could be relied upon; and he requested his Lordship to draw the inference from these three propositions. But this agent, on arriving in London and communicating with Erasmus Lewis, the late secretary to Lord Oxford, and now an active mem-

had with the Regent, in a letter to the Pretender, Oct. 21. 1715. Stuart Papers. He adds, “I have only told it the Queen; Lord Bolingbroke knows nothing of this; it being desired by Mr. O’Brien (the Regent) that he should not.”

\* See Duclos, *Mémoires*, vol. i. p. 402. ed. 1791.

† Bolingbroke writes, however, to the Pretender: “There are at Havre 1300 arms, 4000 weight of powder, and other stores on board another ship which is not yet discovered. I intend to send her, as I write to Lord Mar.” September 21. 1715. See Appendix.

ber of the Jacobite conspiracy, learned that Mar had already gone to raise the Highlands. It is positively asserted by Berwick, that the Pretender, without any intimation either to himself or Bolingbroke, had sent orders to Mar to begin the insurrection in Scotland without further delay.\* The veracity and the means of information of Berwick are equally unquestionable; yet it seems difficult to credit such an extremity of falsehood and folly in James. There are several circumstances to disprove, there are none to confirm it; and, on the whole, I suspect that Berwick must have been misled by an excuse which Mar afterwards invented for his own rashness. James himself, writing to Bolingbroke on the 23d of September, expresses an anxious desire that his Scotch friends will at least wait for his answer, if they cannot, as he hopes, stay so long as to expect a concert with England.† Is it not beyond belief that he should already, several weeks before, have given positive orders to the opposite effect—that he should have issued such momentous directions at a moment so unfavourable, and concealed them from his best friends and most able advisers?

The insurrection once raised, however imprudently, there was no other course for the Chevalier than to maintain it vigorously. Both he and Ormond gave abundant proof of personal courage. The latter immediately set off from Paris; and the former was as fully prepared to leave Lorraine and take ship for Great Britain, although Bolingbroke observes, that it was then no longer possible to carry over even such a handful of men as should secure the Prince from being taken by the first constable he might meet on shore.‡ He had several times fixed a day for his departure from Commercy, but had as often been compelled to postpone it, in compliance with the earnest injunctions which he received from England, and which continued to prescribe delay.§ It was not till the 28th

\* Berwick, *Mém.* vol. ii. p. 158.

† James to Lord Bolingbroke, September 23. 1715. See Appendix.

‡ Letter to Sir William Wyndham.

§ See Lord Mar's account from France. Tindal, vol. vi. p. 506. James's partisans circulated a shameful rumour that Lord Stair had formed a plan for his assassination on the road. See *Mém. de St. Simon*, vol. xiii. p. 403.

of October, that, freed from these trammels, he set out in disguise, and travelled westward to St. Malo.

Meanwhile the Duke of Ormond had sailed from the coast of Normandy to that of Devonshire\*, where, according to his last engagements with his partisans, he expected to find them in arms. But the English Government had now taken vigorous measures to nip the rebellion in its bud. Maclean, an active agent of Ormond, had betrayed him.† The principal friends of Ormond were arrested; the others dispersed; and when the Duke came to the appointed place he found no signs of a rising—not a single man to meet him, instead of the thousands he expected; and he was compelled to steer again towards France. On landing in Brittany he found, at St. Malo, the Chevalier just arrived from Lorraine, and actively employed in shipping off supplies for Scotland. After several conferences with him, the Duke again embarked, with the daring and indeed desperate project of throwing himself upon the English coast, and taking the chance of some favourable circumstances; but a violent tempest forced him back a second time. On the other part, the Chevalier seeing the plan of the English insurrection baffled, and having completed his business at St. Malo, resolved to proceed himself to Scotland; but having been obliged to postpone his sailing for a few days, he found it at the end of that time to be no longer practicable, the harbour being closely blockaded by several English men-of-war. In this extremity the young Prince set off by land from St. Malo, where, says Bolingbroke, he had as many Ministers as there were people about him. He travelled privately on horseback across the country to Dunkirk, having previously sent directions that a ship should be prepared for him in that port. There he arrived in the middle of December, when he immediately embarked on board a small vessel of eight guns, attended only by six gentlemen, who were, like himself, disguised as French naval officers; and with this scanty retinue did the last heir of the Stuarts set sail for their ancient kingdom.

\* He took with him only about twenty officers and as many troopers from Nugent's regiment. *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 165.

† Lord Bolingbroke to the Pretender, Nov. 8. 1715. See Appendix.



We must now revert to what had been passing on the other side of the Channel, and especially to the proceedings of Lord Mar.

John Erskine, eleventh Earl of Mar, was made of the willow and not of the oak. He had early in the late reign entered public life as a Whig; he had afterwards turned Tory; he had again joined the Whigs in promoting the Scottish Union: but in 1710, when the Tories came into power, he discovered that his principles were entirely in accordance with theirs, and readily became their Secretary of State, and manager for Scotland. His embarrassed fortune has been urged, but should scarcely be admitted, as an excuse for these changes, which had gained him no very honourable nickname in his native country.\* On the accession of George he had addressed to that monarch a letter full of loyal congratulations and warm professions of attachment.† Finding himself, nevertheless, deprived of office, and with little hope of regaining it under that government, he plunged headlong into all the intrigues of the Jacobites, and became their chief for Scotch as Ormond for English affairs. He was a man of great activity, judgment, and address, but no knowledge of war; at home in Court cabals, but, as we shall afterwards find, unskilful and helpless in a camp. In person he was deformed, and his enemies were accustomed to say of him that his mind was as crooked as his body.

Till the moment of his leaving London, Mar evinced no common duplicity. On the 1st of August he appeared at the levee of King George; on the 2d he set off to raise the Highlands for King James. He embarked in disguise, with Major-General Hamilton and Colonel Hay, on board a small collier; and it is even said that, the better to conceal his rank, he wrought for his passage.‡

\* He was called "Bobbing John." See Chambers's History of Dundee's and Mar's Rebellions, p. 172. — a very compendious and pleasing narrative.

† See this letter in Tindal's History, vol. vi. p. 406.

‡ Memoirs of the Master of Sinclair, p. 51. MS. I am indebted for the communication of this valuable document to the kindness of my friend Mr. Lockhart. It is copied in about 1400 quarto pages, and enriched with notes by Sir Walter Scott. The Master of Sinclair



From Newcastle he proceeded northwards in another vessel; and, landing on the coast of Fife, he went from the house of one friend to another until he reached his own seat in the "braes" or hills of Aberdeenshire. During his journey he had sent letters to the principal Jacobite gentlemen, inviting them to a great hunting match on the 27th; such entertainments being in the Highlands common pretexts for political councils, and precursors of military risings.

On the 27th, accordingly, there was a large meeting at Lord Mar's, attended by the Marquesses of Huntly and Tullibardine, eldest sons of the Dukes of Gordon and Athol; by the Earl of Southesk, the chief of Glengarry, and several other noblemen and gentlemen. Lord Mar addressed the meeting in an elaborate speech, owning his error in having promoted that "accursed treaty," the Union; and declaring his resolution to retrieve his fault by attempting to restore his country to her ancient independence. The claims of their rightful sovereign — His Majesty's commands to rise — his promise to come amongst them in person — England ripe for insurrection — France teeming with supplies — were not forgotten in Mar's ha-

was eldest son of Henry seventh Lord Sinclair, and had served under Marlborough, but was sentenced to death for having killed two brother officers in duels. He fled into the Prussian dominions with the connivance of Marlborough, and afterwards obtaining the Queen's pardon, went to reside at his paternal seat of Dysart, in Fife. He engaged in the rebellion of 1715, and was attainted; but a pardon for his life being granted him in 1726, he returned to Dysart, where he remained till his death, in 1750. "He seldom," says Sir Walter, "ventured to Edinburgh, and was then always well armed and attended, holding himself still in danger of the vengeance of the Schaws, or other enemies. The following memoirs," Sir Walter continues, "are written with great talent and peculiar satirical energy. They are intended as a justification of the author's own conduct, but are more successful in fixing a charge of folly and villany upon that of others than in exculpating his own. They will be a precious treat to the lovers of historical scandal, should they ever be made public. The original memoirs, written by the hand of the author, are in the library at Dysart; but there are other transcripts in private collections, though some, I understand, have been destroyed, to gratify those whose ancestors fall under the lash of the Master. It is remarkable that the style, which at first is not even grammatical, becomes disengaged, correct, and spirited in the course of composition."

range, nor without effect upon his audience. All present took an oath to be faithful to one another, and to the Earl of Mar as the general of King James; and agreed to return each to his own estate for the purpose of raising his men, and afterwards bringing them together.

It appears, however, from the most authentic documents, that the Scotch gentlemen, though willing to obey the call of the Chevalier, were, from the first, by no means sanguine of success. They saw well what slight chances of victory were to be balanced against the imminent hazard of their lives and fortunes; and the death of Louis the Fourteenth, of which they were soon apprised, however it might be glossed over by Mar's creatures\*, seemed to the most discerning a fatal blow. Yet a deep and devoted, however mistaken, sense of duty overbore every other consideration in their breasts. Who that reads of the lofty forgetfulness of self, of the chivalrous attachment to the fallen, that shone forth in the three rebellions of 1689, 1715, and 1745, and that notwithstanding repeated reverses—"for all that" and all that, and twice as much as all that," in the words of their own spirit-stirring song—still stood firm and undismayed, does not feel inclined to cry shame upon the charges of mean selfishness and calculating caution, so often cast upon this brave Scotch people? Who will not own that they have generous actions to show against the empty words of their maligners? Never, in my opinion, did any nation combine in a more eminent degree the sense and shrewdness which are sometimes thus unfairly urged as their reproach with the highest courage and most unconquerable fidelity.

Lord Mar, having sent orders to his vassals to join him, raised the standard of the Chevalier on the 6th of September, at Kirkmichael, a village of Brae Mar. He was then attended by no more than sixty men.† The standard, on its erection, was consecrated by prayers; but the Highlanders, ever watchful of omens, observed

\* "Malcolm said (on being told of Louis's death) he was very well pleased to hear it, for a young prince such as the Regent would push our affair with more vigour than the old King, who was half doated." Master of Sinclair's MS. p. 84. See also p. 105.

† Patten's History of the Rebellion of 1715, p. 153. ed. 1717.

as an unfavourable sign that as the pole was planted in the ground the gilt ball fell down from its summit.

The next care of Mar was to issue several letters, declarations, addresses, and manifestoes; papers very various in title, but nearly the same in substance.\* His little force was now daily increased by fresh followers. About 500 of his own vassals joined him on foot. The gentlemen who came on horseback were formed into a body under the Earl of Linlithgow, entrusted with the guard of the standard, and dignified by the name of the "Royal Squadron." This body, which at the outset was only of twenty horse, soon grew into several hundreds.† Meanwhile the flame was spreading in all directions. The white cockade—such was the emblem of the English as it is now of the French Pretender—was assumed by clan after clan. The first to rise was that of MacIntosh; they had nearly 500 in arms, and seized the important post of Inverness. James was proclaimed by the Earl of Panmure at Brechin, by the Earl Marischal at Aberdeen, by Lord Huntly at Gordon, and by Mr. Graham, brother to the celebrated Claverhouse, at Dundee. On the 14th, Colonel John Hay, brother of the Earl of Kinnoul, obtained possession of Perth; and the Earl of Rothes, who was advancing to secure that place for the Government, with some men from Fifeshire, retired without a blow. In short, nearly the whole country to the north of the Tay was in the hands of the insurgents.

Meanwhile a scheme had been formed by the Jacobites in another part of Scotland, which, if successful, would probably have put them at once in possession of the whole of that kingdom. About eighty persons at Edinburgh, chiefly Highlanders, had plotted to seize and surprise the Castle, a stronghold of infinite importance, and containing nearly all the arms, stores, and money then at the disposal of the Government. At the head of the conspirators was a Roman Catholic nobleman, Lord Drummond.

\* In his letter to his own bailiff, on the 9th, he says, "Let my own tenants in Kildrummie know that if they come not forth with their best arms, I will send a party immediately to burn what they shall miss taking from them! . . . . By all that's sacred, I'll put this in execution!"

† Master of Sinclair's MS. p. 118.

By dint of some bribery, and the cheaper expedient of high promises, they gained over three soldiers in the garrison\*, and resolved to scale the Castle rock, at a place on the north side near the sallyport, where it seemed the least precipitous, and where one of their friends would be the sentinel at the time appointed—the 9th of September, at nine o'clock at night. Ladders of a peculiar construction had been prepared, which were to be drawn up by the Jacobite soldiers, and fastened to a strong stake within the wall, so as to enable the conspirators to climb. It had also been concerted, that on obtaining possession of the Castle they should fire three cannon; that when this signal should be heard by some men stationed on the opposite coast of Fife, a fire should be kindled on the heights; and that these beacons, continued northward from hill to hill, should, with the speed of a telegraph, apprise Mar of his advantage, and enable him to complete it by immediately pushing forward to Edinburgh.

But, unhappily for Mar, a very slight accident was sufficient to defeat this promising scheme. One of the Jacobites engaged in it, Mr. Arthur, had communicated the whole design to his brother, Dr. Arthur, a physician. Dr. Arthur, a timid man, and a recent convert, was much agitated at these tidings, and could not disguise from his wife his feelings of uneasiness and anxiety; nor, when pressed by her curiosity for the cause of them, had he the firmness to conceal it. Thus entrusted to a woman, the secret soon ceased to be so. The lady, without her husband's knowledge, sent an anonymous letter to the Lord Justice Clerk, informing him of the whole conspiracy. Her letter did not reach his Lordship till ten, nor his express the Castle till eleven o'clock on the evening of the 9th; so that, had the conspirators been punctual to their time, their object might have been already attained, in spite of the disclosure. But some of them carousing at a tavern, and drinking deep bumpers to the success of their enterprise, allowed the moment for its execution to slip by, and did not bring the ladders to the foot of the

\* “One sergeant, William Ainslie, and two privates, were engaged “in this scheme. Ainslie was afterwards hanged.” Sir Walter Scott's note on Sinclair's MS. p. 97.

Castle rock until two hours after their appointment.\* Scarcely had the three sentinels above begun to draw the ladders, when the time for the change of guard arrived, and when the officers of the garrison were roused by the news of the express. One of the Jacobite sentinels, seeing other soldiers coming round the rampart, fired his piece, and called out below that they had ruined both themselves and him. His companions, at the same time, let go the ropes. The conspirators beneath (some of them much hurt by the fall of the ladders) immediately dispersed; and, although a party of the city guard sallied out upon them from the West Port, in hopes of making prisoners, only four of them were taken. These proved to be, Ramsay and Boswell, writers to the Signet; Leslie, late page to the Duchess of Gordon; and Captain Maclean, a veteran of the field of Killiecrankie. Thus, through the combined influence of wine and women, was this daring scheme defeated.

The Cabinet of St. James's meanwhile had no easy game to play. The whole force at its disposal in Great Britain was scarcely above 8000 men.† With these it had not only to encounter secret conspiracies, undisguised rebellions, and threatened landings in many places, but also to keep the peace in several other districts, where the mob, inflamed by malicious insinuations, and zealous in the cause of the Church, which they believed to be endangered, pulled down meeting houses of Dissenters, and committed other acts of riot and outrage. With such scanty numbers the Ministers had to support the throne of George and to brave the enmity of Louis — to confirm a new dynasty and overawe an ancient rival. The chief control and direction in this arduous duty fell upon Secretary Stanhope, on account of his military character. The Duke of Marlborough was indeed far

\* "They were so far from carrying on their affairs privately, that a gentleman who was not concerned told me that he was in a house that evening, where eighteen of them were drinking, and heard the hostess say that they were powdering their hair to go to the attack of the Castle!" Sinclair's MS. p. 103. A strange sort of powder to provide on such an occasion!

† The army estimates for 1715 show us a total of more than 16,000 men at the expense of 556,000*l.*; but of these less than 9000 were at home. See the Comm. Journ. vol. xviii. p. 47.



more highly qualified for that or any other service; but, as I have already mentioned, was then an object of aversion at Court, and deprived of all real and effective power.\* The state of Scotland had, of course, been from the first a matter of great anxiety. So early as the 24th of July, Stanhope had obtained leave to bring in a Bill "for the encouragement of loyalty in Scotland,"† by which it was hoped in some degree to bridle the disaffected clans. Yet, when at the end of August the first intelligence came that these clans were actually gathering, Stanhope and his colleagues concurred in thinking that this array was only designed as a stratagem to draw the King's forces northward, and favour the projected insurrection of Ormond in the west; and such, in fact, was the opinion held at this time by the Jacobites themselves at Bristol and other places.‡ The Ministers accordingly determined to send no more troops to Scotland; on the contrary, it was to the south-western counties that they ordered the few regiments at their disposal. They directed General Whitham, the Commander-in-Chief in Scotland, to march with the handful of regular troops (about fifteen hundred) that could be mustered, and take post at Stirling, so as to maintain the passage of the Forth; but almost immediately afterwards they superseded him in behalf of the Duke of Argyle, whose personal knowledge of the country, and whose princely influence over it, could not fail to be most important in the coming struggle. Argyle might be considered an hereditary foe of the Stuarts, yet his attachment to the Whig party was very recent and doubtful, and no man had taken a more active part towards their expulsion from office than himself. On that occasion he seems to have been guided by a mean resentment against Marlborough, who thought but lightly of his character, and who goes so far as to say, in one of his private letters, "I cannot have a worse opinion of any man than I have of the Duke of Argyle."§ By the new Tory adminis-

\* Look back to p. 104.; and see Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 81.

† Comm. Journ. vol. xviii. p. 237. This Act received the Royal Assent on the 30th of August.

‡ Tindal's History, vol. vi. p. 421.

§ To the Duchess, March 25. 1710.



tration, which he had contributed to raise, he was sent to succeed Stanhope in Spain—an appointment which, from the desperate state of affairs, added nothing to his laurels. His return to England was soon followed by his rupture with the Ministry; he was dismissed from his employments, and rejoined his former friends, who, though they could scarcely place any very unmixed confidence in his support, yet knew its value too well to receive it otherwise than warmly. This powerful chieftain was born in 1678.\* His influence was not confined to the Highlands, nor his talent to a field of battle; he was also distinguished as a speaker in the House of Lords; and though extremely cool and collected in his conduct, his oratory was warm and impassioned.† His manner was most dignified and graceful, his diction not deficient in elegance; but he greatly impaired its effect by too constantly directing it to panegyrics upon his own candour and disinterestedness—qualities of which I firmly believe that no man ever had less.

The Earl of Sutherland, also a zealous friend of the Protestant Succession, was directed to embark in a King's ship, the *Queenborough*, and sail for his domains in the extreme north of Scotland, with a commission to raise his vassals, as well as any other clans on which he might prevail in favour of the established Government.

Other measures of great vigour and activity were taken by Stanhope and his colleagues. According to an article in the guarantee for the Protestant Succession, the Dutch had bound themselves to furnish a body of 6000 men, in case of need; and to claim this contingent, Horace Walpole was now despatched to the Hague. At home, the Parliament was induced to vote most loyal Addresses—

\* It is stated in Collins's *Peerage* (vol. vi. p. 443.) that he was twenty-three in 1705; but here he appears to be confounded with his brother, the Earl of Isla, who afterwards succeeded him in the Dukedom.

† Thomson says of him, "From his rich tongue persuasion flows."—"I thought him," says Lord Chesterfield, "the most affecting, persuasive, and applauded speaker I ever heard. I was captivated, like others; but when I came home and coolly considered what he had said, stripped of all those ornaments in which he had dressed it, I often found the matter flimsy and the arguments weak." Letter to his son, December 5. 1749.

to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act—to grant liberal supplies—to offer a reward of 100,000*l.* for seizing the Pretender alive or dead—and to empower the King to seize suspected persons. All half-pay officers were recalled to active service. Twenty-one regiments (7000 men) were ordered to be raised.

At Edinburgh the Government, availing themselves of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, arrested and imprisoned in the Castle several noted Jacobites; the Earls of Hume, Wigtoun, and Kinnoul, Lord Deskford, and Messrs. Lockhart of Carnwath and Hume of Whitfield. By a clause in the new Act for encouraging loyalty in Scotland, which had passed on the 30th of August, the King had also been empowered to summon any suspected persons to Edinburgh, there to give security for their good behaviour; or, in case of non-appearance, to be denounced as rebels. This provision was immediately put in force by the Lord Advocate, and a great number of persons were summoned; but the effect is admitted, on all hands, to have been very unfavourable to the Government. It drove to a decision those wavering politicians who would, in all probability, have remained quietly at home, without declaring for either party; and the decision thus forced upon them was almost always for their secret inclination—the Pretender. Scarcely any obeyed the requisition; and most of them gave civil excuses to the one party, but active assistance to the other. Thus, for example, the veteran Earl of Breadalbane, a man nearly fourscore years of age, sent to Edinburgh an affidavit of his ill health, which is still preserved, and which exhibits a most dreadful array of all human infirmities. Coughs, rheums, and defluxions—gravel and stitches—pains in the back and kidneys—seem the least in the catalogue; it declares him unable to move without danger to his life; and it is attested “upon soul and conscience” by a neighbouring physician, and by the minister of the parish.\* Yet, on the very day after the date of this paper, the old Earl had left home and joined the army of Mar!

That general was still in the Highlands. He had

\* See the collection of Original Letters and Papers on the Rebellion of 1715, printed at Edinburgh, 1730, p. 20.

found great difficulty in raising the Athol men, from the Duke of that name making no manifestation in his favour; but it has been alleged by his enemies that he himself had secretly endeavoured to disgust the Duke of Athol with the enterprise, apprehending that, should this powerful nobleman join the insurgents, he and not Mar would be considered their leader.\* To obtain the Duke's men, but without the Duke, is said to have been Mar's object; and he at length succeeded in it, through the exertions of Lord Tullibardine and two of his brothers. Above 500 from that country joined their young Marquis. At length, on the 28th of September, Mar made his entry into Perth; when his forces fell but little short of 5000 men. On the same day, also, he was cheered by the arrival of Mr. James Murray, second son of Lord Stormont, with most auspicious tidings from Commercy. Twelve ships, full of arms and ammunition, were described as ready to sail, and the Chevalier as resolved to follow them without delay. One or two small ships of that kind had, in fact, already reached the Scottish coast, and safely disembarked their stores, and accident threw into Lord Mar's hands a similar supply from a different quarter. A vessel had been equipped at Leith by the government, and freighted with 300 stand of arms for the use of the Earl of Sutherland's party in the North. Stress of weather compelled the vessel to take shelter under the Fife coast near Burntisland; and the skipper, being a native of that place, took advantage of the gale to go ashore and visit his family. On the 2d of October, intelligence of his neglect of duty was brought to Perth; it was determined to try this favourable opportunity; and at five o'clock the same evening, a party of eighty horse, under the command of the Master of Sinclair, sallied from the gates. They arrived at Burntisland about mid-

\* Sinclair's MS., p. 116. "It is certain," he adds, "the Duke was "of that consequence that he'd have done more in one day in raising "the Highlands than Mar in two months." See also p. 236. I have seen in the King's Library at the Brit. Mus. (Polit. Pamph. case 95.) a MS. "*Mémoire de ce qui s'est passé dans le pays d'Athol et des "loyales defences que sa Grandeur le Duc a faites pour le service du "gouvernement.*" 1715. It was no doubt drawn up in French in order to be laid before the King.

night, surprised the skipper in his bed, seized the arms in the ship, and returned safely the same night with their booty, though, both in going and coming, they had to pass within ten miles of Stirling. This exploit gave peculiar satisfaction to the insurgents, as tending not only to augment their own resources, but to impair those of a formidable enemy; and it also encouraged Mar to push his outposts along the coast of Fife, and to station garrisons in the castles of Burntisland and of Falkland.

Meanwhile the Duke of Argyle had arrived in Scotland about the middle of September, and hastened to the camp at Stirling. He had brought with him not a single battalion of troops, not one piece of artillery. He had found under his command no more than 1000 foot, and a body of dragoons, partly from that excellent regiment the Scots Greys\*, but altogether of only 500 men. His own clan was kept quiet by the dread of an inroad from General Gordon with a party of Mar's followers; on his flank and rear, Glasgow, Dumfries, and other towns, were threatened by the Jacobites; and there seemed great danger of his being completely surrounded at Stirling, and yet he could not move from before its ramparts without still more imminent peril. Under such circumstances, the course for Mar to follow was plain. He could, early in October, have mustered above 8000 men; with which, says Marshal Berwick, he ought to have immediately marched forward; and he could scarcely have failed to drive Argyle before him headlong over the Tweed, and obtain possession of the whole of Scotland.† But it was now that Mar's want of military

\* "The dragoons, called the Scots Greys for many years, maintained a character greatly superior to that of an ordinary regiment. They never gave a bounty exceeding a crown, and were recruited from a class of persons greatly superior to those who usually enter the army, such as the sons of decent farmers and tradesmen, who felt a vocation for the army. No ignominious punishment was ever inflicted, and a criminal who had merited such was previously transferred to another regiment." Sir Walter Scott's note on Sinclair's MS. p. 304.

† *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 160. The Marshal adds, "L'on peut avoir beaucoup d'esprit, beaucoup de courage personnel, être habile ministre, et toutefois n'avoir pas les talens requis pour une entreprise de cette nature. Il est certain que Mar ne les avait pas."

genius grew apparent. He had been very successful in prevailing upon the Highland chieftains and stirring up the clans, a task which required only address and management; but having thus drawn the sword, it remained a useless weapon in his inexperienced hands. He lingered at Perth for several weeks, awaiting the movements of the Jacobites in England, who, on their part, were also in a great measure at gaze, and in expectation of his movements. In civil wars, to lose an opportunity is to lose all; and the victory belongs to the swift still more than to the strong.

There were several other circumstances that should have warned Mar against such procrastination. First, the disposition of his Highlanders, who were as usual careless of stratagem, eager for battle, and likely, if withheld, to cool in spirit and to dwindle in numbers; next, the great expense, and consequent disgust, occasioned by delay to the principal gentlemen engaged, from the necessity of their maintaining many of their subordinate friends and vassals; thirdly, the host of jarring pretensions and claims to command amongst the leading men, which must always be expected in an irregular force, and which can only be prevented by frequent enterprise and active employment. The Master of Sinclair, who was present, complains bitterly of the number of gentlemen, who "were not satisfied with being Colonels when they were "not capable of being Corporals!" He tells us, also, that Mar being jealous of his authority, did not sufficiently consult nor willingly employ his ablest officers, and trusted too much to the judgment of one Major Clephane. "To make," he says, "his Lordship's sudden military genius more conceivable and natural, Clephane "was cried up to the skies, and was always buzzing in "his ear, like Mahomet's pigeon, and it was granted "there wanted no more to make a consummate general "than Mar's head and Clephane's practice."

The movements of the English Jacobites, on which Mar so much depended, will now require some detail. Stanhope had continued to take the most vigorous measures against them. Lords Lansdowne and Duplin, and the titular Duke of Powis, were committed to the Tower; a warrant was issued against the Earl of Jersey; and



Lieutenant-Colonel Paul, of the Guards, being detected in enlisting men for the Pretender, was secured. On the 21st of September, the very day of the adjournment of Parliament, which did not meet again for business till next year, Stanhope brought down to the Commons a message from the King, desiring their consent for apprehending six members of their House, whom His Majesty had cause to suspect of treasonable practices. These six members were Sir William Wyndham, Sir John Packington, Mr. Edward Harvey, Mr. Forster, Mr. Anstis, and Mr. Corbet Kynaston; all men of violent High-church principles, and considerable local power. The consent requested was unanimously granted by the House; and Harvey and Anstis being still in town, were immediately apprehended. The former stabbed himself in two or three places of the breast, but his wounds proved to be not mortal. Sir John Packington was brought up to London from his house in Worcestershire; Sir William Wyndham was seized at his in Somersetshire, while asleep in bed: however, pretending to go into an inner room to take leave of his wife, who was with child, he made his escape through a postern. A proclamation, offering a reward of 1000*l.* for his discovery, was now issued; and Sir William finding that one of his letters had been intercepted, and that his retreat was likely to be tracked, thought it prudent to surrender himself. Accordingly, coming up to London, he put himself into the hands of Lord Hertford, his brother-in-law, who sent notice of it to Stanhope. The matter was then laid before the Privy Council, the King himself being present; and the Duke of Somerset, the father of Lady Wyndham, offered to be responsible for the conduct of his son-in-law. It was no light matter to refuse and offend the first Protestant Peer of the country—a firm friend of the Hanover Succession—a powerful leader of the Whig party. But Lord Townshend considered the proofs against Wyndham so strong, and the necessity for his arrest so urgent, that he resolutely made a motion for that object. A long pause ensued. During nearly ten minutes no other member ventured to support him; until at length two or three rose together to second the motion. It was carried; and as the King withdrew into his closet, he took Lord



Townshend's hand, and said, "You have done me a great service to-day."\* Somerset, who expressed his resentment warmly and intemperately, was removed from his office of Master of the Horse—the first appearance of a schism in the Whig administration.†

The arrest of Wyndham, whose influence in the western counties was predominant, and who held the threads of the whole Jacobite conspiracy, was of great avail in breaking and unravelling its texture. Troops had also been marched into that quarter; Bristol, which the Jacobites intended to surprise, was carefully guarded by Earl Berkeley, as Lord Lieutenant of the county; several chests of fire-arms, and about 200 horses, designed for the use of the insurgents, were there discovered and seized, and their most active agents arrested. At Plymouth, where a similar attempt had been projected by the Jacobites, similar precautions were taken against them; and Sir Richard Vyvyan, a stirring Cornish gentleman of considerable note, was sent up to London in the custody of a messenger.

The University of Oxford also felt the rod of power. That learned body had of late scarcely made a secret of their disaffection to the Government. On the flight and attainder of the Duke of Ormond, their Chancellor, they had, as a token of approbation of his principles, conferred that dignity upon the Earl of Arran, his brother; and their honorary degrees were in like manner reserved only for non-jurors, or at least High Tories. An intercepted letter from an undergraduate to his friend in London boasts that "Here we fear nothing, but drink James's health every day." Colonel Owen and several other broken officers had taken shelter at the University, and were concerting measures with the Heads of Houses, and projecting an insurrection, to be combined with that of Bristol; but Stanhope, having intelligence of the design, sent thither General Pepper, one of his Brihuega officers, with a squadron of dragoons. Marching all night, Pepper entered Oxford at day-break, on the 6th of October.

\* Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 71.

† See Somerset's personal animosity against Townshend and Stanhope in his letter to Lord Isla of Dec. 13. 1716. Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 148.

He immediately summoned to his presence both the Vice-Chancellor and the Mayor, delivered to them a letter from Stanhope, and acquainted them with his orders to seize eighteen suspected persons. The two dignitaries, scared at the unexpected sight of soldiers, readily promised him their assistance towards this object, and the soldiers began their search; Pepper, at the same time, declaring to the Vice-Chancellor that if any disturbance happened, or if any persons assembled in the streets above the number allowed by the Riot Act, he would order his men to fire. No such extremities, however, came to pass. Colonel Owen, who was lodging at the Greyhound Inn, leaped over a wall in his night-gown, and escaped into Magdalen College; but of the other suspected persons ten or twelve were taken, and the soldiers left the town. Such proceedings, it must be owned, bear something of a harsh and tyrannical aspect, and seem more worthy of Spain or Italy than of England. Yet, by these measures was the intended insurrection crushed in its bud, and the bloodshed which must have followed it happily averted; nor should we forget that the apparent mildness which forbears to punish faults is, in many cases, real cruelty which tempts to crimes. No rising whatever took place in the west; and when Ormond, as already mentioned, came off Plymouth, according to his appointment, he found no one ready to meet him, and was refused, says Bolingbroke, a night's lodging in a country which he had been told was in a good posture to receive the Chevalier himself. The importance of the service done to the House of Hanover in this transaction will best be estimated by the fact that the Jacobite party had always considered Ormond's design as far more hopeful and momentous than Mar's.

In the north of England, however, affairs took a less pacific turn. The shires of Lancaster and Northumberland were, more than any others in England, imbued with the lingering spirit of Catholicism; and Mr. Forster, one of the persons aimed at in the King's Message of the 21st of September, was member for the latter county. A messenger had been sent down to seize him at Durham; and a writ was also entrusted to the same person against the Earl of Derwentwater, a young nobleman

whose influence was considerable in the north, and whose Jacobite zeal was inflamed by his tenets as a Roman Catholic, and by his descent as sprung from an illegitimate daughter of Charles the Second. Hearing of the orders for their arrest, and being thus driven to extremity, both Forster and Derwentwater resolved, rather than surrender, to precipitate their intended insurrection. By appointment with some friends they met on the 6th of October, at a place called Greenrig, from whence they marched the same night to the small town of Rothbury. Their force was then only sixty horse; but, on proceeding to Warkworth, they were joined by Lord Widdrington\*, another Roman Catholic Peer, with thirty more. They chose Mr. Forster for their general: not on account of his superior influence and station, still less from any supposed abilities or military knowledge, but simply because he was a Protestant, and because it was thought unwise to rouse the popular animosity by placing a Papist at their head. Forster himself, but in disguise, proclaimed the Chevalier at Warkworth with sound of trumpet, and as many other formalities as a remote village could admit. From Warkworth he marched to Alnwick, and from Alnwick to Morpeth. He had many offers of assistance from the country people; but had no arms to equip them, and received no others than horsemen. Of these, however, no small number joined him from the borders; so that on entering Morpeth, he could muster as many as 300.

It seems probable that a rapid advance might have given the insurgents possession of Newcastle, where several leading gentlemen, especially Sir William Blackett, were eager to receive them; but their delay enabled the inhabitants to prepare for defence. A great majority

\* This was the fourth Lord Widdrington, great grandson of the one killed on the King's side in 1651. "He was," says Clarendon, "one of the most goodly persons of that age . . . . a gentleman of "the best and most ancient extraction of the county of Northumberland, and of a very fair fortune." (Hist. vol. vi. p. 504. ed. 1826.) The accounts of his descendant in 1715 are much less favourable. "I could never discover anything like boldness or bravery in him," says Mr. Robert Patten, the chaplain — no doubt an excellent judge of military prowess. (Hist. p. 61.)

there, as almost every where in England, was warmly in favour of the Protestant Succession: 700 men came forward to enlist as volunteers, the walls were hastily repaired, the gateways closed up with stones, and this important post was secured. Thus disappointed, the insurgents withdrew towards Hexham, where they hoped to communicate with their friends in Lancashire; and they had already sent an express to Lord Mar, to explain their want of foot soldiers, and entreat his assistance in that respect.

Meanwhile another insurrection was breaking forth in the south-west of Scotland. Lord Kenmure proclaimed the Chevalier at Moffat on the 12th of October, and next day attempted to surprise Dumfries; but the Marquis of Annandale, with some attendants, having thrown himself into that town, it was secured for the King. Within a few days, Lord Kenmure was joined by the Earls of Nithisdale, Wintoun, and Carnwath, and other persons of note; but the chief command still remained with himself.\* He determined to unite his forces — they were about 200 horsemen — with those of Mr. Forster, and for that object proceeded through Hawick and Jedburgh, over the border to Rothbury, where, on the 19th, he was joined by “the handful of Northumberland fox-hunters,” as Sir Walter Scott contemptuously calls them.† From thence the combined body, being apprised of Lord Mar’s having sent Brigadier MacIntosh and a reinforcement to their aid, and of his appointing Kelso as the place of junction, directed their march to that town.

The expedition of Brigadier MacIntosh had been planned even before Mar received intelligence of the Northumbrian insurrection. I have already had occasion to notice his ruinous procrastination in lingering at Perth, and not attacking, as he might, and defeating, as he must, the scanty numbers of Argyle. Instead of such judicious boldness, he began to weave a complicated web of strata-

\* “He was of a singular good temper, and too calm and mild to be qualified for such a post, being plain both in his dress and in his address.” (Patten’s Hist. p. 52.) This is the first time, I believe, that fine clothes have been reckoned amongst the requisites for a good General.

† Note to Sinclair’s MS. ad fin.

gems, and designed, in his own phrase, to enclose the Duke "in a hose-net" at Stirling. For this purpose he had already despatched to his right a body under General Gordon to seize Inverary, keep the Campbells from rising, and then descend upon the English army from the west. On his left he wished to affect a similar diversion, by sending another detachment across the Frith of Forth, and threatening Argyle from the rear. The soldiers selected by Mar for this latter service were picked men, chiefly from the clan MacIntosh, and the regiments of Lords Nairn, Strathmore, and Charles Murray: they amounted to nearly 2000, and their command was intrusted to Brigadier MacIntosh of Borlum\*, a veteran of very great experience, zeal, and intrepidity. It was no easy matter to cross the Frith in safety, there being then three English men-of-war at hand, to guard against any such attempt. But in hopes of mis-directing their attention, another detachment of 500 men was marched to Burntisland, and made apparent preparations for effecting a passage at that place. The consequence was, that the men-of-war immediately sailed to that point to intercept them, if they attempted to come over. No sooner was the enemy thus engaged, than MacIntosh, having obtained some open boats at Crail, Pittenweem, and Elie (small ports twenty miles to the eastward), embarked his men secretly at night, and put to sea. Next morning, the first object descried by the English seamen was the fleet of boats already half way over the channel. They attempted to give chase; but wind and tide being, as MacIntosh had calculated, both against them, they could only send their boats in pursuit, and only capture one of the enemy's. Forty insurgents were thus taken prisoners and conveyed to Leith, where they were secured in the gaol; of the others, two or three hundred, with the Earl of Strathmore, were stranded on the islet of May; but the remainder, to the number of 1600, safely reached the main land at the ports of Aberlady and North Berwick.

The local authorities at Edinburgh stood aghast at an

\* Borlum was the name of the Brigadier's estate (Chambers's *Rebell*. p. 217.); and Mr. Hogg is mistaken in calling it Borland, after a small place in Perthshire. (Jacobite Relics, p. 151. ed. 1819.)



enterprise so dexterous and so daring. Their city was by no means prepared against an attack; but they had in their Provost, Sir George Warrender, an active and undaunted chief. An express was immediately sent to Argyle, entreating his assistance; and measures were taken to barricade the gates, to provide arms, and to enlist volunteers. Brigadier MacIntosh had previously formed no design against Edinburgh, nor was any such authorised by his instructions; but, hearing of the public consternation and the defenceless state of the city, and believing this great prize to be within his grasp, he determined to push forward and seize it. Accordingly, having stopped at Haddington one night to refresh his men, he, on the 14th of October, advanced against the capital; and in the evening he reached a place called Jock's Lodge, within a mile of Edinburgh. Here he learnt that the Duke of Argyle was every moment expected, and that a considerable number of the citizens had taken arms. He therefore thought it expedient to pause in his progress, and turned aside towards Leith, where he threw open the gaol, and released the forty prisoners captured in their passage. From thence late the same night, he crossed to North Leith, and took up his quarters in the citadel.

The citadel of Leith was a square fort with four demi-bastions, and a dry ditch around it, built in the time of Cromwell, but since in a great measure dismantled. It afforded, however, to MacIntosh no contemptible position for defence; and during the night, he obtained from the government stores at the Custom-house a large quantity of meal, brandy, and other articles of provision; he took eight pieces of cannon from the vessels in the harbour to mount upon his ramparts, and he supplied the place of gates by hasty barricades of wood; so that the next morning found him ready, if required, to stand a siege.

On the other side, the Duke of Argyle had answered the call of the Provost with remarkable promptitude and judgment. He took with him two or three hundred dragoons, and about as many foot, whom he mounted on country horses, and, by dint of great expedition, he came in sight of Edinburgh a few hours after MacIntosh, and entered the city at 10 o'clock that night. Being



joined next morning by the horse militia of the neighbouring district, and also by the city guard and volunteers, he found himself at the head of about 1200 men; with which force he marched to North Leith; and coming before the citadel, sent forward a messenger with a summons to surrender, and a threat, that, if compelled to use force, he would give no quarter.

A Highland gentleman, the Laird of Kinnachin, appeared upon the ramparts to answer this summons. "Surrender," he said, "was a word they did not understand, and he hoped never would. Quarter they were determined neither to take nor to give. As for an assault, if his Grace were prepared to give, they were no less prepared to receive it."

Argyle was, in fact, by no means able to execute his threat. He dismounted, and deliberately walked round the citadel, surveying it both on the land and sea side; but finding no vulnerable point, he determined to postpone the attack till next morning, when he expected the aid of some artillery; and for that day accordingly he marched back with his force to Edinburgh. But it was now apparent to MacIntosh that the arrival of this force from Stirling had blighted his hopes of reducing the city. On the contrary, it was far more probable that he himself would be taken, so soon as artillery was brought against him. Moreover, he felt that acting as he did against his instructions he was liable to a heavy responsibility, and could only escape the most severe censure by the most splendid success. On these grounds he determined to resume his original plan, to steal forth from the citadel of Leith that night, and direct his march to the south of Scotland.

Having thus resolved, MacIntosh sent a boat over the Frith, to inform Mar of his designs; and, as the vessel left the shore, he directed a shot to be fired after it; by which stratagem, he deceived the crews of the English men-of-war, who supposed the boat to belong to one of their friends, and made no attempt to intercept it. When night had completely set in, MacIntosh silently marched from the citadel, proceeding along the beach, and across the head of the pier, where his men were knee deep in water. He entered Musselburgh before midnight, and

early on Sunday, the 16th, he arrived at Seton Palace, the seat of their partisan, the Earl of Wintoun, about seven miles from Edinburgh\*, where he availed himself of a very strong garden wall as an intrenchment, and prepared for a vigorous defence in case of pursuit from Argyle.

Meanwhile, Lord Mar had been rejoined by Lord Strathmore and the troops stranded in the Isle of May, who, unable to fulfil their original destination, had found an opportunity of sailing back to Fife. The insurgent general had also received early tidings of the deviation of MacIntosh from his instructions, and of the departure of Argyle from Stirling. He perceived that the only diversion which he could make in behalf of his lieutenant was by marching forwards with his army towards Stirling, since thus he might probably draw the Duke from Edinburgh, and rescue MacIntosh from danger. If, on the other hand, Argyle should remain absent, it might then be easy for Mar to disperse the remaining English troops, and effect the passage of the Forth. With these views, he immediately put his army in motion. Startled at his approach, General Whitham, who was second in command at Stirling, immediately despatched a pressing letter to Argyle, entreating him to return as soon as possible with his detachment.

This express reached the Duke on the night of Sunday, the 16th. He had already been apprised of the new position of the insurgents at Seton House, and had determined to assail them the next day. But the danger of Stirling, and of his whole army, overbore every other

\* Seton House had some time before been forcibly entered and rifled by the Lothian militia. Lord Wintoun, in his answer to the articles of impeachment against him (Jan. 23. 1716), ascribes their conduct entirely to "private pique and revenge. The most sacred "places," he adds, "did not escape their fury and resentment: they "broke into his (Roman Catholic) chapel, defaced the monuments of "his ancestors, took up the stones of their sepulchres, thrust irons "through their bodies, and treated them in a most barbarous, inhuman, and unchristian-like manner!" (Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 280.) I wish that I were able to contradict this disgraceful charge. Lord Wintoun had not at that time taken arms against the government: he was living peaceably in his own house; so that there was no pretext, but his religion, for such outrages.

consideration, and he hastily quitted Edinburgh on Monday morning, with nearly all the forces he had brought, and thus, by a singular combination of events, whilst MacIntosh seemed to run from Argyle, Argyle, on his part, seemed to run from MacIntosh. The activity and judgment of the Duke deserve, however, the highest praise on this occasion; and by his timely retreat he saved Stirling, as by his timely coming he had saved Edinburgh. At four o'clock that afternoon Mar had already reached Dumblane, six miles from the English camp, with 4000 men, and an equal number following at a short distance in the rear; and nothing could have prevented his onset but Argyle's arrival—nor ought that. The insurgent general should undoubtedly have given battle at a time when his enemy's force was so much less than he could hope again to find it; yet he preferred the timid resolution of turning round and marching back to Perth without striking a blow, alleging as excuses that the country about Dumblane was too exhausted to supply him with provisions; that he could not leave the north exposed to the incursions of Lord Sutherland; that he had not yet received all the reinforcements he was promised. The truth is, as William the Third observes in one of his letters, that “whenever there is an unwillingness to do any thing, reasons against it are easily found to prove that impossible which is not so.”\*

MacIntosh, meanwhile, remained two days at Seton House, expecting an attack from Argyle. Had he known of that General's departure, he might, perhaps, have resumed his designs against Edinburgh, although the number of volunteers and Militia now assembled could scarcely have admitted of his success. A party of these, which had sallied forth under Lords Rothes and Torphichen, deprived him, however, of all intelligence as to the state of the city; and on the 19th he began his march, struck across the wilds of Lammermoor, and on the 22d joined the southern insurgents at Kelso. The combined force was then about 2000 men, namely, 1400 foot under MacIntosh, and 600 Northumbrian and Dumfries-shire horsemen under Lord Kenmure and Mr. Forster.

\* Letter to the Duke of Shrewsbury, dated August 30. 1694, and printed in the Shrewsbury Correspondence.

Two plans were now open for the adoption of this army. First, to march southwards and engage General Carpenter, an officer of great merit, second in command at the battles of Almenara and Zaragoza and at the defence of Briliuega, and high in Stanhope's confidence, who had now been sent as the military chief to Newcastle, and who was advancing at the head of about 900 cavalry. As these were newly levied, and very raw soldiers, there appeared a reasonable prospect of defeating them with more than twice the number of irregular troops, and such a victory would have cast no small lustre on the rebel arms. The second plan was to march northwards to take Argyle in the rear, so as to co-operate with an attack of Lord Mar in front. Either of these plans, if decidedly pursued, seemed to promise great advantages; but the difference of opinions as to their comparative merit precluded both. The Scotch officers refused to enter England, the English were determined to advance no further in Scotland. Under these circumstances, they agreed upon a miserable compromise. They determined to march neither against Carpenter nor against Argyle, but to proceed along the range of the Cheviots, and to keep at nearly the same distance from the Border—a senseless half-measure, which failed as much as half-measures commonly do. The leading officers, on this occasion, instead of forming a rational and deliberative body, seemed rather to resemble an inanimate mass, which, when drawn by equal forces in different directions, naturally takes an intermediate course.

One of the first results of their folly was, that Carpenter and his dragoons falling into their track, and following in their rear, gave to their march the appearance of a flight. The disputes amongst themselves were also kept alive by the want of a final decision, and daily grew louder. On one occasion the English even threatened to surround the Highlanders, and compel them to march, but the mountaineers merely cocked their pistols, and calmly observed, that if they were to be made a sacrifice, they were determined at least that it should be in their own country. It was with great difficulty that this quarrel was hushed. At length, having reached Langholm, at no great distance from the Irish Channel,

and being deterred from a project they had formed of investing Dumfries, it became necessary for them to determine their further movements; and after a long altercation, they finally resolved upon an invasion of Lancashire, where they had good grounds to expect the rising and junction of the Roman Catholic gentry. MacIntosh entered heartily into the scheme, but was unable to prevail upon all his followers; and a detachment of 500, disregarding his orders, marched away to the northward by themselves.

The remaining body of the insurgents entered England on the 1st of November, and took up their quarters for that night at Brampton, a small town in Cumberland, where Mr. Forster opened a commission which he had received during the march from Lord Mar, authorising him to act as their General in England. Next day they proceeded to Penrith. The Posse Comitatus had been called out to oppose them: it was headed by the Bishop of Carlisle and Lord Lonsdale\*, and amounted to above 10,000; but these ignorant men, having formed to themselves a dreadful idea of the insurgents, were seized with a panic terror at their approach, and dispersed in all directions. A great number of horses and of prisoners were taken; but the latter, being of far less value to the insurgents than the former, were immediately released. From Penrith they pursued their march through Appleby and Kendal to Kirby Lonsdale, every where proclaiming the Pretender, and levying the public money. They received no assistance from the leading Catholics in Cumberland and Westmoreland; most of them, such as Mr. Howard of Corby, and Mr. Curwen of Workington, having been previously secured by the government in Carlisle Castle. At Kirby, however, Mr. Forster was joined by some of the Roman Catholic gentlemen of Lancashire; and they now entered that county, directing their march upon the town of the same name. Lancaster was then occupied by the notorious Colonel Chartres, who wished to defend the place by blowing up the

\* This bishop was Dr. William Nicholson. Lord Lonsdale was the third and last Viscount of the first creation. He died unmarried in 1750. He is said, in Collins's Peerage, to have been "a great patriot, and a Lord of the bedchamber," — a happy combination!



bridge over the Loyne, and preventing the enemy's passage; but this being opposed by the inhabitants, he retired, and the rebels entered without hindrance. They had here the satisfaction to release several of their friends imprisoned in the county gaol, especially one Thomas Syddal, who had headed a mob at Manchester in pulling down a meeting house. On the 9th they pushed forward to Preston, from whence Stanhope's regiment of dragoons, and one of Militia, withdrew on their approach. The insurgents received at this place a very large accession of force, being joined by nearly all the Roman Catholic gentry of the district, with their servants and tenantry, to the number of about 1200.\* Most of these, however, were very imperfectly armed; some had swords and no muskets, others had muskets and no swords; many had no other weapons than pitchforks, and none had any notion of discipline, so that this rabble might be considered an incumbrance rather than a succour; and thus Preston, instead of affording new energy to the English rebels, became, as we shall presently find, the term of their inglorious career.

General Carpenter, on learning that the rebels were in full march into England, had also crossed the border, and hastened by forced marches to Newcastle and Durham, from whence he combined his movements with General Wills, an officer who had served with distinction in the Spanish campaigns, and who had now been sent by the Government to command in the north-west. The Jacobites had certainly cause to lament that their friends should, during the last year, have raised so many riots in Lancashire, more troops having accordingly been sent to that quarter than would otherwise have been the case. Wills had at his disposal Wynne's, Pitt's, Stanhope's, Honeywood's, Munden's, and Dormer's regiments of cavalry; consisting, for the most part, of newly levied men, but comprising good and experienced officers. These forces were assembled by Wills first at Manchester,

\* Lancashire was very strongly Jacobite. Lord Sunderland, in 1719, speaks of one Mr. Crisp, a gentleman of estate there, who had acted with so much zeal for the Government during the Rebellion, that (what does the reader suppose?) "he has never been able to live "in the country since!" See Appendix to vol. ii.



and more completely at Wigan, to which Stanhope's regiment had retired from Preston, and to which Wills marched on the 11th. Having there received intelligence that Carpenter was advancing from the opposite quarter, and would be ready to take the rebels in flank, he determined to set his own troops in movement the next morning. It was on the evening of the 11th that Forster first became aware of Wills's approach. Disheartened and confounded, that incapable chief, instead of giving his orders or summoning a council, only retired to bed; and it was not till roused by Lord Kenmure and other officers from his unseasonable slumbers that he directed any measures for defence.

Preston was a place whose natural advantages might have seemed to insure an obstinate resistance, did not resistance, as all history shows, depend infinitely more on the spirit of the defenders than on the strength of the ground. Even an open town like Zaragoza becomes a citadel when garrisoned by Aragonese; even the triple ramparts of Gaeta are of no avail with Neapolitans upon them! In front of Preston was a bridge over the Ribble, where a handful of resolute men might have stood their ground against an army. From this bridge to the town (a distance of about half a mile) the road ran through a hollow between two steep banks. This was the place where, in 1648, Oliver Cromwell had encountered such stout resistance from the Royalists, who are said to have rolled down large stones from the heights upon him and his men; one of these stones coming so near him, that he could only escape by making his horse leap into a quicksand.\* But Forster took no advantage of this pass. He confined his measures to Preston itself, stationed his men in the centre of the town, and drew barricades along the principal streets.

So evident to a military eye was the importance of the bridge over the Ribble, that when Wills, on the 12th, reached that point, and found it undefended, he came to the conclusion that the rebels must have retired from

\* Patten's History, p. 99. We may observe, however, that no mention of this mode of resistance is made by Clarendon (*Hist.* vol. vi. p. 74. ed. Oxf. 1826), nor by Cromwell himself in his official despatch. (*Rushworth's Coll.* vol. vii. p. 1237.)

Preston, and were returning to Scotland. As he approached the town, however, and found the enemy ready to maintain it, he prepared for an immediate onset. Under his direction two of the barricades were gallantly charged by separate divisions, but their intrepid attack was met with equal courage. A destructive fire was poured upon them, not only from the barricades, but from the neighbouring houses, and they had few opportunities to retaliate upon their invisible assailants. When the night came on they withdrew, having suffered considerable loss, and made little impression. Early next morning General Carpenter arrived with some of his cavalry ; but even after this junction the King's troops, according to Marshal Berwick's statement, did not exceed 1000 men.\* But whether or not able to overpower Mr. Forster, they were enough to terrify him. Quite disheartened, he, without consulting several of his principal officers, sent Colonel Oxburgh to propose a capitulation. Oxburgh found Wills by no means inclined to treat ; the General saying that he would not enter into terms with rebels ; that they had already killed many of his Majesty's subjects, and must expect to undergo a similar fate. After many entreaties he at last relented, so far as to say, " that " if the rebels would lay down their arms, and surrender " at discretion, he would protect them from being cut to " pieces by the soldiers until further orders from the " Government."†

The news of this proposal filled many of the insurgents with the highest indignation. " Had Mr. Forster," says an eye-witness, " appeared in the streets, he would have " been slain, though he had had a hundred lives." The Highlanders, especially, almost rose in mutiny ; wishing to rush upon the King's troops sword in hand, and cut their way through them to their native country ; but the chiefs, divided amongst themselves, perceived that it was too late for an enterprise which could only have been accomplished by a hearty and combined determination.

\* *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 162. His short sketch of this rebellion, and his account of numbers on other occasions, are remarkably accurate. He had, of course, the best sources of information.

† See Wills's evidence at Lord Wintoun's trial. *Howell's State Trials*, vol. xv. p. 854.

They resolved to yield to their fate, gave up Lord Derwentwater and Colonel MacIntosh\* as hostages, and induced their followers to lay down their arms. Amongst the captives were Lords Derwentwater, Widdrington, Nithisdale, Wintoun, Carnwath, Kenmure, Nairn, and Charles Murray; and members of the ancient northern families of Ord, Beaumont, Thornton, Clavering, Patten, Gascoigne, Standish, Swinburne, and Shafto. The total number taken was only 1400; a number so unequal to the previous computation as to show that many—above all, no doubt, the Lancashire peasants—had either escaped from the town, or disguised their persons in it. Seventeen of their men had been killed in the defence; of the King's troops seventy, and as many wounded. Thus ingloriously ended the English insurrection! Thus helpless are even the bravest men when without an able one!

Another illustration of this truth was given in Scotland on the very day of the surrender of Preston. Mar had continued to linger at Perth even beyond the commencement of November, whereas a true general might have been master of Scotland six weeks before. It is well observed by Sir Walter Scott, that, "with a far less force than Mar had at his disposal, Montrose gained eight victories and overran Scotland; with fewer numbers of Highlanders, Dundee gained the battle of Killcrankie; and with about half the troops assembled at Perth, Charles Edward, in 1745, marched as far as Derby, and gained two victories over regular troops. But in 1715, by one of those misfortunes which dogged the House of Stuart since the days of Robert the Second, they wanted a man of military talent just at the time when they possessed an unusual quantity of military means."† During this senseless delay, the force of Argyle at Stirling had been more than doubled by reinforcements from Ireland; for one amongst the many errors of the Jacobites, both in 1715 and 1745, appears to have been their neglect of the sister island; probably because they considered it too remote to bear very power-

\* This person is confounded by Mr. Chambers (*Hist.* p. 281.) with the Brigadier. See the evidence at Lord Wintoun's trial.

† Note to Sinclair's MS. ad fin.

fully on a conflict for the Crown of England; but their inactivity in a country where they had so many partisans enabled its government to dispose of the troops which must otherwise have been left for its defence. Several regiments landing from Ireland hastened to the standards of Argyle, and raised his army to 3300 men, of whom 1200 were cavalry, so that it seemed probable this occasion would again confirm the old proverb—"Forth bides the wild Highlandman."

On the 10th of November, Mar, at length starting from his lethargy, marched from Perth with all his baggage, and provisions for twelve days. Next morning he was joined at Auchterarder by General Gordon and some of the western clans\*, and the combined body amounted to upwards of 10,000 men, but presented a very motley appearance;—gentlemen and their servants on good horses, equipped with swords and pistols; volunteers from the towns on foot; Lowland peasants with arms slung over their plain grey clothes; Highland chiefs and DUNNIE WASSAILS in their own romantic garb; and a train of half-naked mountaineers; "and upon the whole," says Sinclair, "though we had more men, the Duke's army had more firearms in a condition to fire."† On the 12th, the troops came to Ardoch, within eleven miles of Stirling; and Argyle, learning their approach, did not hesitate to give them battle, but marched forward and occupied the town of Dumblane.

Early next morning, Sunday the 13th, both armies advanced against each other. The ground which now lay between them had been the former place of meeting for the Militia of the sheriffdom of Menteith, and thence called the Sheriffmuir; it was swelling and uneven, but well suited to evolutions of cavalry. Even before quitting Stirling, Argyle, anxious to avail himself of his superiority in horse, had resolved to meet the enemy, if possible, at that very spot. He now ranged his troops in battle-order, taking to himself the command of the

\* Gordon had not been very successful in his expedition to Argyleshire. Lord Isla, brother to the Duke, had thrown himself into Inverary, and held out the place with great bravery. Sir W. Scott's note to Sinclair, p. 699.

† Memoirs, p. 795.

right, giving the left to General Whitham, and the centre to General Wightman. On the other side, the insurgents displayed equal alacrity; and the brave spirit of the Highlanders, so long curbed by the timid counsels of Mar, now burst forth free and unrestrained, like a mountain eagle from its cage. When the Earl summoned his principal officers around him, and proposed to them the alternative of a battle or a retreat, his voice was drowned by impatient cries of Fight! Fight! "and we were no sooner got to our posts," says one of them, "than a huzza began, with tossing up of hats and bonnets, and ran through our whole army on the hearing we had resolved to fight. No man who had a drop of Scots' blood in him, but must have been elevated to see the cheerfulness of his countrymen on that occasion."\*

Mar himself took post at the head of the clans opposite the left wing of the Royal troops, and endeavoured to outflank them by his superiority of numbers. It was, however, on the other wing that the battle began. The insurgents in that quarter opened against Argyle a fire so simultaneous and so well sustained as to extort the praises of even their practised opponents; it was such as few regular forces could have surpassed, and still fewer have stood. But the Duke was not inactive. His experienced eye turned to a morass on his right: it was usually impassable; but he calculated the effects of the last night's frost, and commanded Major Catheart to lead a squadron over the hardened level, and strike upon the enemy in flank. Meanwhile he put himself at the head of his remaining horse, and, watching the favourable moment, charged the rebels at once both in front and side. Discipline carried the day; the rebels were beaten back at the point of the sword. They made, however, a most resolute resistance, and, in their retreat upon the river Allan, less than three miles distant, they made above ten attempts to stop and rally. Argyle, on his part, behaved with no less humanity than courage: he offered

\* Sinclair's MS. p. 805. General Wightman says in his official despatch, "I must do the enemy the justice to say, I never saw regular troops more exactly drawn up in line of battle, and that in a moment, and their officers behaved with all the gallantry imaginable."



quarter to all those he recognised ; and, on one occasion, was seen to parry three strokes which one of his dragoons had aimed at a wounded gentleman. At length, after an obstinate fight of two or three hours, the Duke succeeded in forcing the enemy over the Allan, a great number being drowned in the stream ; but meanwhile he had altogether lost sight of the rest of his army, where affairs had assumed a very different appearance. The clans commanded by Lord Mar had opened their fire upon the Royalists left wing. The first fire of the English in return mortally wounded the Chief of Clanranald, a gallant veteran who had served abroad under Marshal Berwick, and who is remembered in the Highlands to this day for his feudal state and splendour. For a moment the fall of this revered leader damped the courage of the clans. But Glengarry\*, starting from the ranks, and throwing his bonnet into the air, "Revenge ! Revenge !" he cried in Gaelic ; "to-day for revenge, and to-morrow for "mourning!" Fired at these quickening words, the Highlanders rushed forward ; in another moment they were upon—amongst the enemy, thrusting aside the bayonets with their targets, and by their broadswords spreading destruction and—what with Englishmen is still more difficult—terror through the hostile ranks. In a few minutes the whole of Argyle's left wing was completely routed. General Whitham fled headlong from the field, and never stopped till he found himself in the streets of Stirling. Nor do terrified generals ever want followers. A part of the Royal centre gave way with their left wing, and had these been vigorously charged, the whole might have been scattered ; but this opportunity being neglected, chiefly from the obstinacy and waywardness of the Master of Sinclair, General Wightman drew off three regiments of foot to the right, and then marched forward to rejoin Argyle.

The two armies were now in a very strange situation, each having defeated the left wing of the other. Argyle had had no communication with the main body of his forces ; an aide-de-camp whom he sent for that purpose

\* This was the same chief who had carried the Royal Standard at the battle of Killiecrankie. He died in 1724. Scott's note to Sinclair, p. 292.



having fallen as he passed along the lines; and it was afterwards ironically said of the Duke by his enemies, that he had strictly fulfilled the Christian precept of not letting his left hand know what his right was doing. On being joined, however, by the three regiments of foot, and learning the disaster of the rest, he with an undaunted spirit \*, immediately drew together his weary soldiers, and led them back to the field of battle. Lord Mar, on his part, had driven the fugitives before him as far as Corntown, a village near Stirling, when he heard of the Duke's success on the other wing. At this intelligence he stopped short, ranged his men in some order, and marched back to the Sheriffmuir, where, fearful of ambuscade or surprise, he took up his position on some rising ground. From thence he soon beheld the harassed forces of Argyle on their return, slowly toiling along the road, at the bottom of the hill. So scanty was their number, and so exhausted their strength, that a single charge down-hill must have, in all probability, destroyed them. Argyle himself fully expecting an attack, ranged his men behind some enclosures and mud walls, placed two cannon in his front, and steadily awaited the danger. In this position both armies remained for some time, gazing at each other; but the energy of Mar utterly failed him at this decisive crisis. Instead of crying Forwards, he gave orders for a retreat in the opposite direction; and the Duke, hearing the sound of the receding bagpipes, quietly pursued his march to Dumblane, where he fixed his quarters for the night. It was on this occasion that Gordon of Glenbucket, one of the insurgent Highlanders, his heart swelling at the torpor of his general, made the celebrated exclamation, "Oh, for an hour of Dundee!" †

\* One of his officers observing to him that he much feared his Grace had not won a complete victory, Argyle answered in two lines of an old Scotch song :—

"If it was na weel bobbitt, weel bobbitt, weel bobbitt,

"If it was na weel bobbitt, we'll bobb it again."

† Scott's note to Sinclair's MS. p. 843. "If they had but thrown down stones," says Sir Walter, "they might have disordered Argyle's troops." General Wightman himself owns in his official despatch (Nov. 14. 1715), "If they had had either courage or con-

Thus ended the desultory and half-fought battle of Sheriffruin. Both parties eagerly claimed the honour of a victory in their despatches, thanksgivings, and sermons\*; but the Duke showed the better right to it, by re-appearing on the field of battle the next morning with his guard, while Mar never came again within several miles of it. Argyle might also boast of the usual trophies of success — having captured four pieces of cannon, thirteen stand of colours, and three standards, including the Royal one, called “the Restoration.”† The loss of men sustained by the two armies bore a more equal proportion. The insurgents are supposed to have had 700 killed, including the young Earl of Strathmore‡, and other persons of note; nearly 200, amongst them Lord Strathallan, were sent prisoners to Stirling; and many more had been taken, but were rescued in the course of the engagement; as was the case, for instance, with the Earl of Pannure, and Mr. Robertson of Strowan. The Duke’s army had nearly 200 killed, as many wounded, and scarcely fewer taken; the most eminent among the last being the Earl of Forfar and Colonel Lawrence.

It must also be observed, that several of the chiefs and soldiers in Mar’s army were, at best, but lukewarm in the cause, and inefficient in the conflict. According to the Master of Sinclair’s own avowal, it appears that he, Lord Huntly, and several others, were desirous, even before the battle, of treating with Argyle and laying down their arms.§ From such men, even though personally brave,

“duct, they might have entirely destroyed my body of foot; but it pleased God to the contrary.”

\* It may be observed that a controversial war of sermons was waged at this period between both camps. The party of the established Government were particularly pleased with a text which they thought happily reflected on the titles of James the Seventh, and of the Pretender as James the Eighth, of Scotland: — “And the beast that was and is not, even he is the *Eighth*, and is of the *Seven*, and goeth into perdition.” Rev. xvii. 11.

† Woodrow Letters, MS., as quoted in Chambers’s History.

‡ “He was taken and murdered by a dragoon; and it may be said of his fate, that a mill-stone crushed a brilliant.” Sinclair’s MS. p. 859.

§ Sinclair’s MS. p. 790. Soon afterwards Sinclair and Lord Rollo secretly offered to go over with the whole Fife squadron! — a fact

no great exertions could be expected. Sinclair, as I have already mentioned, refused to charge. The Marquis of Huntly made what historians, when speaking of great men, usually call "a prudent retreat." Of Lord Seaforth's common Highlanders, we are told, without circumlocution, that they "ran off." Robert MacGregor, afterwards so well known under his nickname of Rob Roy, showed hardly more spirit: when he received orders to advance, he merely said to the messenger, "If they cannot do it without me, they shall not do it with me." The Stuarts of Appin and the Camerons of Lochiel, two of the bravest clans of the Highlands, retired without striking a blow. The latter were commanded by the son\* of Sir Evan Dhu, the renowned chieftain who had fought against Cromwell, and who was still alive in 1715, but incapable, from his great age, of taking the field; and it is said that, on returning home, the clan contrived to keep the event of the battle a secret from their aged chieftain — ashamed to make him feel that the Camerons had declined from the spirit of their fathers.

which Sinclair takes care to suppress in his Memoirs, but which appears from Lord Townshend's despatch of Jan. 10. 1716. See Appendix, vol. ii.

\* This son, John Cameron, was father of Donald, of whom Sir Walter Scott says that "he united all the accomplishments of a "gentleman and scholar with the courage and high spirit of a High-land chief." Notes to Sinclair, p. 292. Donald was the hero of Mr. Campbell's poem, "Lochiel;" and will be frequently mentioned in my narrative of "the 45."

## CHAPTER VI.

AFTER the battle of Sheriffmuir, the Duke of Argyle returned to his former camp at Stirling, satisfied at having arrested the progress of the insurgents, and maintained the passage of the Forth. It was still in the power of Lord Mar to have renewed the conflict, and such was the wish of many of his officers. "If we have not yet gained a victory," said General Hamilton, "we ought to fight Argyle once a week till we make it one." But more timid counsels prevailed, and Mar, leading back his troops to Perth, relapsed into his former inactivity.

The time when he might have acted with effect was, indeed, already flown. It was observed at the time, by even the detractors of Argyle's military reputation, that whether or not Sheriffmuir were a victory for the Duke, it was at least a victory for the King. The clans speedily began to forsake the standards of Mar, and to go home; some in order to secure their plunder, others from shame at their late misconduct; some from having quarrelled with their Lowland allies, others because disheartened at the General's temporising policy. News also reached head-quarters that Lord Sutherland was advancing at the head of the Monroes, the Mackays, and other Whig clans, and that Inverness had been retaken from the insurgent garrison by Forbes of Culloden and Simon Fraser of Lovat.\* This intelligence afforded to Lords Huntly and Seaforth a plausible pretext, which they had for some time desired, of withdrawing from the enterprise. "It was their duty," they said, "to cover their own country;" and they marched with all their retainers

\* This was the famous — may we not say the infamous? — Lord Lovat, executed in 1745. His deceit and treachery are still proverbial in the Highlands. He had originally joined the insurgents of 1715, but now turned against them with the view of establishing his pretensions as head of the family against the claims of a Jacobite heiress. Chambers's History, p. 283.

from the camp ; not, however, without many promises of a speedy return.

Through these and similar causes, Lord Mar's army dwindled to half its original numbers : nor was the remnant firm and compact. There were not a few, who, hopeless of success — apprised of the surrender at Preston — having no tidings whatever of the Chevalier — and believing him, therefore, to be a prisoner in England — were inclined to lay down their arms if they could obtain honourable terms. Mar endeavoured, on the contrary, to persuade them to sign a declaration, which should engage them to stand by the cause and by each other. At length, however, to prevent private and separate treaties, he was compelled to promise that he would ascertain how far Argyle might be inclined to treat, or what terms he might be prepared to offer. For this overture Mar employed two channels of communication : first, the Countess of Murray, the Duke's aunt ; and secondly, Colonel Lawrence, one of the prisoners at Sheriffmuir, who was now released on parole.\* The Duke sent a very courteous answer, declaring that his instructions only enabled him to treat with individuals, and not with the whole body, but that he would immediately apply for more extended powers. According to this promise, he sent his commission to London for enlargement. The Ministers, however, were by no means inclined to come into his views. They had averted Ormond's insurrection ; they had crushed Forster's ; they had, therefore, the best part of their troops at their disposal, and were determined not to treat on a footing of equality with the rebels who still remained in arms, wishing not merely to lop the growth,

\* I have compared Sinclair's *Memoirs*, p. 1086., with Lord Mar's *Journal from France* ; but neither of these is much to be trusted on this point — the former being a philippic against Mar, and the latter his apology. In the collection of original papers (p. 114.) is given a most minute report to Lord Mar from a trumpet, John Maclean, sent to Stirling on a previous message. He especially dwells on the good cheer he received, which to him was probably not the least interesting part of the business : — “ A sentry brought me my dinner, namely, pies, “ roast beef, and hens, and a bottle of wine ; and in the afternoon “ another bottle of wine, and at night a third. . . . . Mr. Kinears “ showed me his embroidered vest, and asked me if I saw any gentle- “ men at Perth with a vest such as he wore ? I said a thousand,” &c.

but to pluck out the roots, of the rebellion. Some reports had already reached them as to Argyle's doubtful and temporising views; and so far from enlarging his commission, they would not even return his old one. Moreover, the 6000 Dutch troops for whom they had applied had landed about the middle of November, and were already in full march to Scotland.

On the arrival of these powerful reinforcements, Argyle's army was increased in a still greater proportion than Mar's had fallen off, and he might now consider the rebels as completely in his grasp. A great fall of snow at this season, and a long continued frost, alone, he said, prevented him from marching against them. Mar remained at Perth only as it were by sufferance, and had secretly determined, whenever Argyle should advance, to yield the town without a blow.\*

It was at the time that the affairs of the Chevalier bore this lowering and gloomy aspect, that he himself arrived in Scotland. I have elsewhere explained the reasons of his long delay, and shown that it was in no degree attributable to any want of zeal or spirit on his part. He landed at Peterhead on the 22d of December, attended by only six persons, one of whom was the Marquis of Tynemouth, son of the Duke of Berwick; and the vessel that brought him was immediately sent back to France with the news of his safe arrival. He passed through Aberdeen without disclosing the secret of his rank, and proceeded to Fetteresso, the principal seat of his young partisan the Earl Marischal, where he was detained for several days by his doubts as to the movements of Argyle.† Meanwhile, Lord Mar, at Perth, had no sooner been apprised of his arrival, than he took horse with the Earl Marischal, General Hamilton, and about thirty other gentlemen, and hastened forward to meet their long expected Prince. Fully convinced as I am of the justice and wisdom of the Hanover Succession, and of the national miseries that must have resulted from its overthrow, I yet cannot divest myself of a feeling of reverence — al-

\* Lord Mar's account from France; Tindal's Hist. vol. vi. p. 492.

† The Pretender to Lord Bolingbroke, Jan. 2. 1716. Stuart Papers. See Appendix. The cause publicly assigned was an ague.



most of partiality — when I behold the unhappy grandson of Charles the First striving for the throne of his fathers, and trace his footsteps on the soil of his ancient dominion.

The reception of Mar at Fetteresso was, as might be expected, highly cordial; the Chevalier warmly acknowledged his past services, and created him a Duke. On the 30th, James set off from Fetteresso, and on the 4th of January he slept at Glamis Castle, the residence of the Earls of Strathmore, which he declared to be the finest gentleman's seat that he had ever seen in any country. Two days afterwards he made his public entry into Dundee on horseback; the Earl of Mar riding on his right hand, and the Earl Marischal on his left, while nearly 300 gentlemen brought up the rear. He was hailed with loud and general acclamations, and, at the request of his friends, remained for an hour at the market-place to gratify the eager affection of the people, who thronged to kiss his hands. Continuing his progress, he, on the 8th, arrived within two miles of the army, at the Royal palace of Scone, where he established his residence, named a regular Council, and performed several other acts of state. He issued six proclamations for a general thanksgiving, in gratitude of the special and "miraculous providence" shown in his safe arrival\*; for prayers in churches; for the currency of all foreign coins; for the meeting of the Convention of Estates; for ordering all fencible men, from sixteen to sixty, to repair to his standard; and for his coronation on the 23d of January.

"At the first news of his landing," says one of the insurgent gentlemen at Perth, "it is impossible to express the joy and vigour of our men. Now we hoped the day was come, when we should live more like soldiers, and should be led on to face our enemies, and not be mouldering away into nothing, attending the idle determination of a disconcerted Council."† His appearance

\* Collection of Original Papers, p. 160.

† True Account of the Proceedings at Perth, by a Rebel. London, 1716, p. 15., a curious and authentic narrative. Mr. Chambers, who quotes this work, is mistaken (note, p. 332.) in ascribing it to the Master of Sinclair. If he had had an opportunity of reading Sinclair's MS. Memoirs he would have found that Sinclair had already gone northwards to Lord Huntly's; that he was not at

amongst his troops was, however, attended with mutual disappointment. He had been promised by Lord Mar a large and victorious army. They had been told that he would bring with him a numerous body of officers, and, perhaps, of men, and a large supply of money, arms, and ammunition. He now came almost alone in the midst of a dwindled and discordant multitude. On making his entry into Perth, the day after he reached Scone Palace, he expressed his wish to see "those little Kings with "their armies," as he called the chiefs and the clans; and one of the most martial tribes of Highlanders was accordingly marshalled before him. He was much pleased at the appearance and the arms of the mountaineers; but, on inquiring how many such were in arms for him, and learning their scanty numbers, he could not conceal his feelings of concern and surprise\*; and in fact, so much reduced was the insurgent army, that they could not venture to disclose their weakness by the customary pageant of a general review.

Nor was there any reasonable hope of speedy reinforcements. Huntly and Seaforth, to whom James had immediately applied, were privately treating with the government for a submission; and the unusual depth of the snow was a reason with some, and a pretext with many others, for remaining at home. Meanwhile, Argyle still continued in front, at the head of an army, now immensely superior both in numbers and in discipline, and he had already pushed his outposts along the coast of Fife, dislodged the insurgent garrisons, and cut off the supply of coal from the camp at Perth.

Difficulties such as these might have baffled even the military skill of Marlborough or the heroic spirit of Montrose. Still less could they be overcome by a young and inexperienced Prince. Had James been bred a Protestant, had he come to the throne by undisputed succession, and had he ruled in tranquil times, he would certainly have been a popular monarch, from his graceful

Perth during any part of these later transactions, and never saw the Chevalier in Scotland.

\* Mar in his previous letters had swelled his army to 16,000 men; *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 170.

manners, his mild temper, and his constant application to business. The letters of his which I have read in the Stuart and other Collections, appear to me written with remarkable ability and power of language. But he had neither that daring energy, nor that sound judgment, which might fit him for the part of leader in trying emergencies. It was once observed by Stanhope to Dubois, that if ever France should fit out an expedition against England, he only hoped, to insure its failure, that the Pretender might be placed at its head.\* Nature had made this Prince a quiet unenterprising man, education a bigoted Catholic, and, like most of the Princes of his race, he combined an obstinate and unreasonable pertinacity in what he had once determined, with a blind submission to favourites, sometimes unwisely chosen and always too readily obeyed.† Even at this period, the crisis of his own fate, he was so little warned by his father's as to refuse, or rather evade, giving the same promise of security to the Church of Ireland as to the Church of England, and stubbornly to withstand all the representations of Bolingbroke upon that subject!‡

The appearance and demeanour of the Chevalier, when in Scotland, seem to be truly described by one of the gentlemen who had taken up arms for his cause:—"His person was tall and thin, seeming to incline to be lean rather than to fill as he grows in years. His countenance was pale, yet he seems to be sanguine in his constitution, and has something of a vivacity in his eye that perhaps would have been more visible, if he had not been under dejected circumstances and surrounded with discouragements, which it must be acknowledged, were sufficient to alter the complexion even of his soul as well as of his body. His speech was grave, and not very clearly expressing his thoughts, nor overmuch to the purpose, but his words were few, and his behaviour and temper seemed always composed. What he was

\* Sevelinges, *Mémoires Secrets*, vol. i. p. 201.

† See the deliberate and reluctant opinion of one of his warmest partisans, Mr. Lockhart of Carnwath, writing in the year 1728; *Lockhart Papers*, vol. ii. p. 405.

‡ Bolingbroke to James, Nov. 2. 1715. Appendix. See also his remarks in the letter to Wyndham.

“in his diversions we knew not; here was no room for such things. It was no time for mirth. Neither can I say I ever saw him smile. . . . I must not conceal, that when we saw the man whom they called our King, we found ourselves not at all animated by his presence, and if he was disappointed in us, we were tenfold more so in him. We saw nothing in him that looked like spirit. He never appeared with cheerfulness and vigour to animate us. Our men began to despise him; some asked if he could speak. His countenance looked extremely heavy. He cared not to come abroad amongst us soldiers, or to see us handle our arms or do our exercise. Some said the circumstances he found us in dejected him; I am sure the figure he made dejected us; and, had he sent us but 5000 men of good troops, and never himself come amongst us, we had done other things than we have now done.”\*

The same writer adds, however, “I think, as his affairs were situated, no man can say that his appearing grave and composed was a token of his want of thought, but rather of a significant anxiety, grounded upon the prospect of his inevitable ruin.” His speech to his Council, also, which was printed and circulated at the time, is marked by sense and spirit. “Whatsoever shall ensue,” he said in conclusion, “I shall leave my faithful subjects no room for complaint that I have not done the utmost they could expect from me. Let those who forget their duty, and are negligent of their own good, be answerable for the worst that may happen. For me it will be no new thing if I am unfortunate. My whole life, even from my cradle, has shown a constant series of misfortunes, and I am prepared (if so it please God) to suffer the threats of my enemies and yours.”

The council held on this occasion, the 16th of January, determined upon several important measures. First, to fortify Perth, a labour which might have been and should have been completed long before; secondly, to impede the advance of the Duke of Argyle by burning Auchterarder, and all the other villages on the road to

\* True Account of the Proceedings at Perth, by a Rebel, p. 19.

Stirling. It was with the utmost difficulty that the Chevalier could be brought to consent to this harsh and invidious project; a reluctant permission, was, however, at length wrung from him, and the measure accomplished. Steps were also taken to summon the absent clans, and to obtain supplies of arms and money; for it was one of the many misfortunes of the Jacobites at this juncture, that a vessel which was bringing them some gold from France in ingots had been stranded, and the treasure lost.\*

Meanwhile the government, dissatisfied at Argyle's procrastination, sent down General Cadogan, one of Marlborough's best officers, to quicken and decide his movements. Cadogan, on coming to Stirling, found the Duke, as he says, anxious to invent excuses for inaction, and labouring to discourage the troops by exaggerating the numbers of the enemy and the dangers of the service.† One of his pleas for remaining quiet was founded on the want of artillery; but Cadogan, proceeding in person to Berwick, hastened the arrival of the expected train. Another of the Duke's objections was the extreme rigour of the season; another the burning of the villages (for excuses are never wanting where inclination is); but the urgency of Cadogan over-ruled all his difficulties, real or pretended, and obliged him, on the 24th of January, to begin employing the country people in clearing away the snow, preparatory to the march of the army.

The news of this intention rapidly flew to Perth, causing great perplexity amongst the chiefs, and great rejoicings amongst the men. The latter were loud and clamorous for battle; the former sat in deliberation the whole night of the 28th, but could come to no decided resolution. "Why, what would you have us do?" said an officer next day to one of the tumultuous parties gathered in the streets. "Do!" cried a Highlander, "what did you call us to arms for? Was it to run away? What did the King come hither for? Was it to see his people butchered by hangmen, and not strike one stroke for their lives? Let us die like men, and

\* Lord Mar's Account from France. This money was part of the loan from Spain. *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 169.

† Coxe's *Life of Marlborough*, vol. vi. p. 334.



“not like dogs!” A gentleman from Aberdeenshire added his opinion, that they ought to take the person of their monarch out of the hands of his present timid counsellors, and then, if he were willing to die like a Prince, he should find there were ten thousand gentlemen in Scotland who were not afraid to die with him.\* These sentiments were no doubt very becoming in brave subalterns; but as certainly it behoved the generals to bear in mind the enormous disproportion of numbers and of discipline—the incomplete defences of Perth and the difficulty of standing a siege—the actual want of fuel and the future want of provisions—the danger of a second Preston—and the possibility that some of the insurgents might be base enough to make terms with the government by giving up the Chevalier. A retreat to the northward, on the contrary, would afford further time for the chance of foreign succours, would secure the person of the Pretender, might entangle Argyle’s army in the intricacies of the Highland hills, expose him to a battle on more equal terms, and deprive him of all service from his cavalry. On these grounds, we can scarcely join the Highland soldiers in condemning as pusillanimous the resolution which was finally taken of withdrawing from Perth, although I admit, there seems reason to believe, that many of the chiefs had already for some time determined to abandon the whole enterprise, to induce the Pretender to re-embark at Montrose, and the army to disperse in the Highlands.

The resolution to retreat, finally formed at a Council on the night of the 29th of January, was promulgated to the army on the 30th, a day whose evil augury for the House of Stuart was observed and lamented by all present. With sullen silence, or indignant outcries, did the Highlanders prepare for their departure; and mournful was the farewell of their friends at Perth, now about to be exposed to the vengeance of the insulted government. Early next morning the troops began to defile over the Tay, which, usually a deep and rapid river, was now a sheet of solid ice, and bore both horse and foot of the retreating army. Their march was directed along the Carse of Gowrie to Dundee.

\* True Account of Proceedings at Perth, p. 28.



On the other hand, the English and Dutch troops did not quit Stirling till the 29th. They advanced that day to Auchterarder, one of the villages burnt by the insurgents, where they encamped all night upon the snow, a few only being partially sheltered by the blackened and roofless walls that still remained. Argyle, leading the vanguard, entered Perth about twelve hours after the last of the insurgents had left it, and, first allowing a day of rest, proceeded with a select body in their pursuit. Cadogan writes to Marlborough at this juncture: "The Duke of Argyle grows so intolerably uneasy, that it is almost impossible to live with him any longer; he is enraged at the success of this expedition, though he and his creatures attribute to themselves the honour of it. When I brought him the news of the rebels being run from Perth, he seemed thunderstruck, and was so visibly concerned at it, that even the foreign officers that were in the room took notice of it. . . . Since the rebels quitting Perth, he has sent for 500 or 600 of his Argyleshire men, who go before the army a day's march to take possession of the towns the enemy have abandoned, and to plunder and destroy the country, which enrages our soldiers, who are forbid, under pain of death, to take the value of a farthing, though out of the rebels' houses. Not one of these Argyle men appeared whilst the rebels were in Perth, and when they might have been of some use."\*

The real motives for Argyle's backwardness are not perhaps very apparent. He may have wished to spare many of the insurgents from private friendship and connection; he may have been afraid lest the forfeiture of their estates should involve the loss of his own seigniorial rights over some of them. It seems to me, however, still more probable, that, considering the chance of invasions from France, or insurrections in England, he was unwilling to act too vigorously against the Chevalier, and to cut off all hopes of future power if that party should prevail. Certain it is, at least, that such was the opinion

\* Letter from General Cadogan to the Duke of Marlborough, dated Feb. 4. 1716, and printed in Coxe's Memoirs. Coxe is mistaken as to the march of the troops from Stirling; they reached Tullibardine not on the fourth day, but on the second.

entertained of his motives by the government at London ; insomuch, that, in a very short time, he was deprived of his command, and recalled to England. It is certain, also, that there was a period in Queen Anne's reign when he was thought by no means disinclined to espouse the Pretender's interests, and that in 1717 and 1718 there was on foot another project for gaining him over to that cause—a project which, according to the judgment of the leading Jacobites, failed chiefly on account of Lord Mar's jealousy and James's consequent refusal to give the positive assurances required.\* With all his valour, skill, and eloquence, there was never, I believe, a more fickle and selfish politician than Argyle.

The insurgent army from Dundee continued its march to Montrose, where the Chevalier was pressed by his secret advisers to re-embark. For some time he turned a deaf ear to their remonstrances, and earnestly pleaded to share the fate of his friends. Every hardship, he said, every danger he was most ready to endure with the men who had sacrificed their all for his service ; and it appears that the only argument to which he finally yielded was, that it would be much more easy for these unfortunate men to obtain terms from the government in his absence than whilst he remained with them. His departure, however, was carried into effect in a manner that gave it every appearance of desertion and deceit. All reports of any such intention were utterly denied ; his guards were ordered to parade as usual before his lodgings, and his baggage was sent forward with the main body of the army, as a pledge of his intention to follow. Having thus lulled the vigilance of his partisans, James, on the evening of the 4th of February, slipped out of a back-door, and proceeded on foot to Lord Mar's quarters, and from thence to the water-side, attended by that nobleman and by several others. They pushed from shore in a private boat, and embarked in a small French vessel, which was waiting for them in the roads, and which immediately stood out to sea. Such is the fate of those whose characters are less daring than their enterprises !

\* See the details of this transaction in the Lockhart Papers, vol. ii. p. 13.

The Chevalier left behind him a commission appointing General Gordon commander-in-chief, and giving him full powers to treat with the enemy; and he also left a letter to the Duke of Argyle, with a sum of money, the remnant of his slender resources, desiring that it might be applied for the relief of the poor people whose villages he had given orders to burn; "so that," he adds, "I may at least have the satisfaction of having been the destruction of none, at a time I came to free all."\*

It is needless to dwell upon the grief and disappointment of the insurgent army after the loss of their leader. They marched towards Aberdeen, hourly growing fewer and fewer, as individuals escaped or concealed themselves in different directions; and from Aberdeen they retired up Strathspey to the wilds of Badenoch and Lochaber. Very few fell into the hands of the enemy, partly from the remissness of Argyle's pursuit to Aberdeen, and partly from the difficulty of sending regular troops into the rugged and desolate tracts beyond it. On the latter point Sinclair has recorded a very remarkable opinion: "I remember that I once heard his Grace of Marlborough say in Flanders, that if ever he commanded against the Highlanders, he would never be at the trouble of following them into their hills, to run the risk of ruining an army by fatigue, and giving them any occasion of advantages, when he could post himself so as to starve them if they pretended to keep together, or till, by their natural inconstancy, they separated; after which every one would do his best to get terms."† In the Highlands the insurgent body finally dispersed: the common men, safe in their obscurity, retiring to their private homes, whilst the gentlemen for the most part took boats in Caithness, escaped to the Orkneys, and afterwards made their way to the Continent.

James himself, after a voyage of seven days, landed safely at Gravelines, and proceeded from thence to St. Germain's. On the morning after his arrival he was

\* The original letter is printed in Mr. Chambers's History, p. 312. Its existence was for some time denied by the Whig writers, who assailed the Pretender's personal character with very unjust though perhaps natural severity.

† Sinclair's Memoirs, MS. p. 343.

visited by Lord Bolingbroke, whom he received with much show of kindness. It was strongly urged upon him by that able Minister, that he should hasten to Bar, and take possession of his former quarters before the Duke of Lorraine had time to desire him to look out for a residence elsewhere. He might otherwise be reduced, from the want of any other asylum, to take shelter in the Papal state of Avignon, which would not only remove him to a greater distance from England, but produce a most unfavourable effect upon the Protestants of that country. James, after some days' delay, and several attempts to obtain an interview with the Regent, seemed to acquiesce in this advice; promised Bolingbroke to set out at five the next morning; asked him to follow as soon as possible, and pressed him in his arms at parting with every appearance of confidence and cordiality. Yet at that very moment he had already decided on the dismissal of the Minister whom he so tenderly embraced. Whether it be that he gave ear to the charge of treachery which others hurled against Bolingbroke to cover their own incapacity and want of conduct—or whether he had been moved by some disrespectful expressions which Bolingbroke had uttered in a drunken sally\*—he took a resolution which, beyond all others, perhaps, set the seal to the ruin of his cause. Instead of posting to Lorraine, he went to a little house in the Bois de Boulogne, the residence of several intriguing female politicians, and there he had private interviews with the Spanish and Swedish Ministers, pleasing himself with an air of mystery and business (one of the surest symptoms of a little mind), and neglecting the only real business which he should have had at that time. Three days afterwards, Bolingbroke unexpectedly received a visit from the Duke of Ormond, who put into his hands two orders in a very laconic style, written by the Chevalier—the one dismissing him from his post as Secretary of State, and the other

\* For the charge of treachery by Mr. James Murray, and the answers by Lord Bolingbroke and his secretary Brinsdon, see Tindal's Hist. (vol. vi. p. 516.) The story of Bolingbroke's drunken expressions does not, I think, rest on very certain authority; it is related more at length in Coxe's Walpole (vol. i. p. 200. See also vol. ii. p. 307.). The charge of treachery is most certainly false.

requiring him to deliver to the Duke the papers in his office — “all which,” adds Bolingbroke, “might have been contained in a letter-case of a moderate size. I gave the Duke the seals, and some papers I could readily come at. Some others, and, indeed, all such as I had not destroyed, I sent afterwards to the Chevalier, and I took care to convey to him by a safe hand several of his letters, which it would have been very improper the Duke should have seen. I am surprised that he did not reflect on the consequence of my obeying his order literally. It depended on me to have shown his general what an opinion the Chevalier had of his capacity.\* I scorned the trick, and would not appear piqued, when I was far from being angry.”

Yet, however any feeling of anger might be disavowed, the reader may easily guess that the fiery spirit of St. John glowed with the strongest resentment. He immediately renounced all connection with the Jacobite party; he even made overtures to Lord Stair for his own pardon in England; and to the Queen Mother, who sent to assure him that his dismissal had taken place without her knowledge, and that she hoped to adjust matters, he indignantly replied that he was now a free man, and that he wished his arm might rot off if he ever again drew his sword or his pen for her son's cause! It is scarcely possible to condemn too much the absurd infatuation which urged the Pretender thus wantonly to cast away the ablest, perhaps the only able man in his service. On this transaction we may suspect the remarks of Bolingbroke. But we should trust the testimony of Marshal Berwick, a man of accurate information and scrupulous veracity, whose attachment to his brother was not in this case warped by any peculiar friendship for the fallen minister. “One must have lost one's reason,” he observes, “if one did not see the enormous blunder made by King James in dismissing the only Englishman he had able to manage his

\* This assertion is confirmed by the letters themselves, now preserved in the Stuart Papers. Thus, on Nov. 15. 1715, James writes, “Our good hearty Duke (Ormond) wants a good head with him. I would have sent Booth, but I could not persuade him.” The orders conveyed by Ormond to Bolingbroke are still amongst the Stuart Papers, and are exactly as the latter describes them.



“affairs; for, whatever may be said by some persons of  
“more passion than judgment, it is admitted by all Eng-  
“land, that there have been few greater Ministers than  
“Bolingbroke. He was born with splendid talents, which  
“had raised him at a very early age to the highest em-  
“ployments; he exerted great influence over the Tory  
“party, and was in fact its soul. Could there then be a  
“more lamentable weakness than to rid one’s self of such  
“a man at the very time when he was most wanted, and  
“when it was most desirable to make no new enemies?  
“If even he had been to blame, it would have been pru-  
“dent to have effected his exclusion by some milder  
“means, and these would not have been hard to find; it  
“need only have been insinuated to him that the coldness  
“which prevailed between him and Ormond would not  
“admit of their acting any longer together. . . . . But  
“to cast a public stigma upon him, and seek to blacken  
“his character with the world, is an inconceivable pro-  
“ceeding, and it has lost King James many more friends  
“than people think. I was in part a witness how Boling-  
“broke acted for King James whilst he managed his  
“affairs, and I owe him the justice to say, that he left  
“nothing undone of what he could do; he moved heaven  
“and earth to obtain supplies, but was always put off by  
“the Court of France; and though he saw through their  
“pretexts and complained of them, yet there was no  
“other power to which he could apply.”

The last and most painful, but unavoidable result, of this rebellion still remains to tell—the conviction and punishment of its leaders. In Scotland few or none of note had been taken, while the surrender of Preston, on the contrary, had given into the hands of Government a great number of considerable persons, both Scotch and English. Of these, some half-pay officers, being treated as deserters, underwent a summary trial before a Court Martial, and were forthwith shot, according to its sentence. About five hundred of the inferior prisoners were sent to Chester Castle, and many others to Liverpool; but those of gentle birth were escorted to London, where they arrived on the 9th of December. From Highgate each of them had his arms tied with a cord across his back (Mr. Forster, though a member of Parliament, not ex-



cepted), their horses being led by foot-soldiers, and the drums of their escort beating a triumphal march; an insult to prisoners before their trial, which the notoriety of their guilt may explain rather than excuse. Having thus made a public entry (for so their enemies termed it in derision), they were divided amongst the four principal prisons, the noblemen being secured in the Tower.

The trial of these last before the House of Lords was the first object of Parliament, when it reassembled on the 9th of January. On that very day Mr. Lechmere, in a long speech, which is still preserved\*, descended upon the guilt of the rebels, and the "many miraculous providences" which had baffled their designs; and ended by impeaching James, Earl of Derwentwater, of high treason. Other members followed, and impeached Lord Widdrington, the Earls of Nithisdale, Wintoun, and Carnwath, Viscount Kenmure, and Lord Nairn. No opposition was offered, and the impeachments were carried up to the Lords on the same day. The accused noblemen were brought before the House on the 19th, and knelt at the bar until the Lord Chancellor desired them to rise, when they pleaded Guilty, acknowledging their crime, and throwing themselves upon the King's mercy—all except Lord Wintoun. Sentence of death was accordingly pronounced upon the former, and preparation made for the trial of the latter.

Of the six Peers thus condemned, one, Lord Nairn, is said to have been saved solely by the interposition of Stanhope. They had been at Eton together, and, though they had scarcely met since that time, yet the Minister still retained so much friendship for his former school-fellow, as earnestly to plead for his life; and finding his request refused by the other members of the Cabinet, he made his own resignation the alternative, and thus prevailed.† Great interest was also made in behalf of the rest. The Duchesses of Cleveland and Bolton, and other ladies

\* See *Parl. Hist.*, vol. vii. pp. 227—238. Lechmere had been made Solicitor-General in October, 1714, but (I know not for what offence either given or received) had ceased to be so in December, 1715. *Beatson's Political Index*.

† See some remarks on this occurrence in *Seward's Anecdotes*, vol. ii. p. 252. ed. 1804. I must observe, however, that it rests chiefly on the evidence of tradition.

of the first rank, accompanied the young Countess of Derwentwater to an audience of the King, and joined her in imploring His Majesty's clemency. On another occasion Ladies Nithisdale and Nairn (this was before Stanhope's interposition had succeeded), concealing themselves behind a window-curtain in an anteroom, and waiting till the King passed through, suddenly rushed forth, and threw themselves at his feet. Attempts were also made elsewhere upon feelings more ignoble than those of compassion; and the first Lord of the Treasury declared in the House of Commons, that 60,000*l.* had been offered to him if he would obtain the pardon of only one, Lord Derwentwater. Several of the staunchest Whigs in the House of Commons — amongst others Sir Richard Steele, with his characteristic good nature — were inclined to mercy. But Walpole took the lead in urging measures of severity, and declared that he was "moved with indignation to see that there should be such unworthy members of this great body, who can, without blushing, "open their mouths in favour of rebels and parricides." When we consider how very greatly and undoubtedly Walpole was distinguished by personal lenity and forbearance during his long administration, his vehemence on this occasion may surely be alleged as no small proof of the real necessity for making some rigorous examples. He moved the adjournment of the House till the 1st of March, it being understood that the condemned Peers would be executed in the interval; but he prevailed only by a majority of seven, the numbers being 162 and 155.

In the House of Lords the friends of the unfortunate noblemen made a still more effectual stand. A debate having arisen on the presentation of their petition, one member of the Cabinet, the Earl of Nottingham, mindful of his former Tory principles and friendships, suddenly declared in their favour. His unexpected defection threw confusion and discord into the Ministerial ranks, the resistance of the Government was over-ruled, and an Address to the King for a reprieve to such of the condemned Lords as should deserve his mercy, was carried by a majority of five.\*

\* See some remarks on this Address in Mr. Hallam's account of Lord Danby's impeachment in 1679. Const. Hist. vol. ii. p. 562.

Astonished and alarmed at this result, the Ministers met in Council the same evening. They drew up the King's answer to the Address, merely stating, "that on "this and all other occasions he would do what he "thought most consistent with the dignity of his Crown "and the safety of his people." They determined, however, to comply with the declared wish of one branch of the legislature, so far as to respite, besides Lord Nairn, the Earl of Carnwath and Lord Widdrington; but, at the same time, to forestall any further pleas or intrigues in favour of the three remaining Peers, they despatched an order for their execution the next morning. A resolution was also taken to dismiss from office Lord Nottingham, his son Lord Finch, and his brother Lord Aylesford, as a mark of the Royal displeasure at the course which the former had so unexpectedly taken in debate. On this Walpole writes as follows to his brother:— "You will be surprised at "the dismissal of the family of the DISMALs; but all the "trouble we have had in favour of the condemned Lords "arose from that corner; and they had taken their PLI to "have no more to do with us; and so the shortest end "was thought the best. There are storms in the air, but "I doubt not they will all be blown over."\*

In the night that intervened, one of the condemned Peers, Lord Nithisdale, had the good fortune to make his escape from the Tower in disguise. His wife, with an heroic courage inspired by tender affection, saved his life at the hazard of her own, sending him forth in her own dress, and remaining a sacrifice, if required, in his place.† Thus the number of noble victims was finally reduced to two; and early next morning, the 24th of February, Lords Derwentwater and Kenmure were brought to the scaffold, which had been erected on Tower Hill, and which was all covered with black. Derwentwater suffered first: he was observed to turn very pale as he ascended the fatal steps; but his voice was firm, and his demeanour steady and composed. He passed some time

\* Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 51.

† Lady Nithisdale's own affecting narrative will be found in the Appendix. Her Lord's escape is overlooked by Coxe where he speaks of three Peers being actually beheaded. *Memoirs of Walpole*, vol. i. p. 73.

in prayer; and then, by leave of the Sheriff, read a paper, drawn up in his own hand, declaring that he died a Roman Catholic—that he deeply repented his plea of Guilty and expressions of contrition at his trial—and that he acknowledged no one but King James the Third for his rightful sovereign. He added: “I intended to “wrong nobody, but to serve my King and country, and “that without self-interest, hoping, by the example I gave, “to have induced others to their duty; and God, who sees “the secrets of my heart, knows I speak truth. . . . . “I am in perfect charity with all the world—I thank “God for it—even with those of the present Govern- “ment who are the most instrumental in my death.” He then turned to the block, and viewed it closely, and finding in it a rough place, that might hurt his neck, he bid the executioner chip it off. This being done, he prepared himself for the blow by taking off his coat and waistcoat, and laying down his head; and he told the executioner that the sign he should give him to do his office would be repeating for the third time, “Lord “Jesus, receive my soul!” At these words, accordingly, the executioner raised his axe, and severed the Earl’s head at one blow. Thus died James Radcliffe, third and last Earl of Derwentwater, a gallant and unfortunate, however misguided and erring, young man, greatly beloved for his amiable qualities in private life, his frankness, his hospitality, his honour. His descendants are now extinct; but his brother, having married a Scottish peeress, was the ancestor of the late Earl of Newburgh. His princely domains in Northumberland and Cumberland are amongst the very few forfeitures of the Jacobites which have never been restored by the clemency of the House of Hanover\*: they are settled upon Greenwich Hospital; but in 1832, a part of them was alienated to Mr. Marshall of Leeds.

The execution of Lord Kenmure, which immediately followed, did not much differ in its painful details. He was attended by his son, by some friends, and by two clergymen of the Church of England. Like Lord Der-

\* A clear rent-charge of 2500*l.* *per ann.* out of these estates was, however, granted to the Newburgh family in 1788. See the Annual Register for that year, p. 139.

wentwater, he showed great courage and firmness; like him, he repented having pleaded Guilty at his trial, and offered up a prayer for the Pretender. He then knelt down at the block, and his head was struck off at two blows.

With respect to Lord Wintoun, his trial did not begin till the 15th of March. He was a man supposed to be in some degree of unsound mind, although, like most persons in that unhappy state, he showed abundance of cunning and dissimulation. His only object seemed to be delay, having retarded his trial by petitions for time, and other such devices; and when, at length, it came to be proved, on unquestionable evidence, that he had freely joined and acted with the rebels, he had little else to urge than that his most material witnesses had not yet arrived, and that the season was very bad for travelling! The High Steward, Lord Cowper, having over-ruled his objections with some harshness, "I hope," said Lord Wintoun, "you will do me justice, and not make use of "Cowper-law, as we used to say in our country; hang a man first, and then judge him!"\* He entreated to be heard by counsel, which was refused. "Since your Lordship will not allow my counsel, I don't know nothing!" He was found Guilty, and sent back to the Tower, from whence he afterwards found means of making his escape.

The trials of inferior offenders came on before the ordinary tribunals. A great number were found guilty. Many were pardoned; several, amongst others Forster and Brigadier MacIntosh, broke from prison; and, on the whole, from the great number of convicts, only twenty-two were hanged in Lancashire, and four in London. Bills of attainder were passed without opposition against Lords Mar, Tullibardine, and many others, in their absence.

It may be doubted whether in these proceedings a tone of calmness and forbearance was in all cases sufficiently preserved by the Judges. Chief Baron Montagu rebuked a jury for acquitting some persons indicted of treason;

\* Howell's State Trials, vol. xv. p. 847. and 892. The true old Scottish saying referred not to *Cowper* but *Cupar*, a town where little mercy was shown to Highland rovers. See, however, a different explanation in the Supplement of Dr. Jamieson (vol. i. p. 282.).



and Lord Townshend's secretary, writing to Stanhope, complains of "the listlessness which reigns in all the courts of justice, except two or three, where men of spirit preside." \* Lord Chancellor Cowper, in passing sentence on the condemned Catholic Peers, could not refrain from inveighing against their religion, and advising them to choose other spiritual guides in their dying moments. Yet no one has ever ventured to assert that any of the condemnations were legally unjust, nor any of the victims innocent. The Tory writers, indeed, raised a loud cry of violence and excessive rigour in the Ministers: "they have dyed the Royal ermines with blood!" says Bolingbroke. But was not some expiation due to other blood—to the blood of those loyal and gallant soldiers who had fallen in conflict with the rebels—to the blood still reeking from the field of Sheriffmuir and the streets of Preston? Was it not necessary to crush the growing spirit of Jacobitism by some few severe examples? Would it have been wise to tempt another rebellion, by leaving the last unpunished? Let us not be misled by that shallow humanity which can only reckon the number of punishments inflicted, and quite overlooks the number of crimes thus prevented—which forgets that rigour to a few may sometimes be mercy to the many.

It has indeed been argued, and still more frequently assumed, that the rebellion of 1715, being founded on a conscientious opinion of hereditary right, and on a loyal attachment to the heir of the ancient Kings, was more excusable than ordinary treason. So far as regards the moral guilt of the insurgents, or their estimation with posterity, this argument I admit to be perfectly well founded. But surely no Government, providing for its own safety, could possibly admit such a principle for a single moment. On the contrary, the more specious were the pretexes of insurrection, the more were measures of repression called for on the part of the reigning dynasty; and, in the words of Gibbon, "the rebel who bravely ventures, has justly forfeited his life."† On the whole, therefore, the execution of the rebels, taken with arms in their hands, seems to me to stand on entirely different

\* To Secretary Stanhope, Sept. 8. 1716. Coxe's Walpole.

† Decline and Fall, vol. xii. p. 242. ed. 1820.



ground from the vindictive proceedings against Bolingbroke and Oxford; and while condemning the latter, I cannot but think, considering the spirit of those times, that the first did not exceed the measure of justice and necessity.

Punishment was not, however, the only object of the Ministers; they thought also of prevention. On the 1st of March, Lechmere moved for leave to bring in "a Bill "to strengthen the Protestant Interest in Great Britain "by enforcing the Laws now in being against Papists"—such, in those times, being the panacea for all evils! Lechmere was seconded by Lord Coningsby, and no member venturing to oppose his motion, the Bill was passed on the 17th of April; and we find that one of its clauses provided for the "effectual and exemplary punishment of such as being Papists shall enlist themselves in "His Majesty's service."\*

But by far the most important and most celebrated measure of the Government was their change in the duration of Parliament. Under the Act passed in 1694 its period had been fixed at three years. The cause of that narrow limitation may probably be found in the enormous period of seventeen years, to which Charles the Second had prolonged his second Parliament, and which, by a natural revulsion, drove the minds of men into the opposite extreme.† The triennial system had now been tried for upwards of twenty years, and found productive of much inconvenience without any real benefit. There is no evidence whatever to prove that the House of Commons had even in the smallest degree shown itself more watchful or public-spirited during that epoch than either before or since; nay, on the contrary, it may be asserted that the grossest and most glaring cases of corruption that could be gleaned out of our whole Parliamentary annals belong to those twenty years. The Speaker (Sir John Trevor), on one occasion, accepted a bribe of 1000 guineas from the City of London, and, on its detection, was himself obliged to put to the vote that he had been guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour.‡ The Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Guy), on another

\* Comm. Journ. vol. xviii. p. 423.

† See Hallam's Const. Hist. vol. iii. p. 201.

‡ Parl. Hist. vol. v. p. 906.

occasion, was sent to the Tower for a similar offence.\* A shameful system of false endorsement of Exchequer bills on the part of several members was detected in 1698 †; and even Burnet, the apologist of those times, is reduced to admit the existence, and deplore the extent, of the corruption.‡

It is not to be supposed, however, that this was the cause which principally, if at all, influenced the Ministers in proposing the restoration of septennial Parliaments. Theirs was a case of pressing and immediate danger. A rebellion scarcely quelled—an invasion still threatened—parties in the highest degree exasperated—a Government becoming unpopular even from its unavoidable measures of defence: such were the circumstances under which, according to the Act of 1694, the Parliament would have been dissolved at the risk of tumults and bloodshed—a most formidable opposition—and, perhaps, a Jacobite majority. What friend of the Protestant Succession could have wished to incur this terrible responsibility? § Even those who may approve of triennial Parliaments in general, would hardly, I think, defend them at such a juncture. According to this view of the subject, there was at first some idea of providing only for the especial emergency; but it was judged more safe and constitutional to propose an uniform and permanent recurrence to the former system. It was, therefore, on permanent grounds that the question was argued in 1716; and I need scarcely add, that it is on such only that it should be considered now.

In considering, therefore, the general question, we may, in the first place, cast aside the foolish idea, that the Par-

\* Parl. Hist. vol. v. p. 886.

† Ibid. p. 1170.

‡ History of his own Times, vol. ii. p. 42. fol. ed. The Bishop adds, "I took the liberty once to complain to the King of this method (of buying votes): he said he hated it as much as any man could do; but he saw it was not possible, considering the corruption of the age, to avoid it, unless he would endanger the whole."

§ "It must be owned," says Mr. Moyle, in a letter at that time to Horace Walpole, "the Whigs, when the Septennial Bill was first proposed, did not relish it at all, but these arguments and the necessity of the times converted them." Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 63.

liament overstepped its legitimate authority in prolonging its existence; an idea which was indeed urged by party-spirit at the time, and which may still sometimes pass current in harangues to heated multitudes, but which has been treated with utter contempt by the best constitutional writers.\* If we look to the practical effects of the change, the most obvious and most important is the increased power of the popular branch of the legislature. Speaker Onslow, a very high authority on this subject, was frequently heard to say that the Septennial Bill formed the era of the emancipation of the British House of Commons from its former dependence on the Crown and the House of Lords.† As a confirmation of this statement, I consider it very remarkable, that, referring to the period immediately preceding, or immediately subsequent, before the Septennial Bill could have time to work this gradual change, no government of those days appears to have felt the necessity of retaining in the House of Commons some of their principal statesmen as its leaders. On the contrary, we find the most active and able party chiefs, such as Harley and St. John on one side, or Montagu and Stanhope on the other, promoted to the peerage whenever their services were thought to deserve that distinction, without any reference to the gap which their absence would leave in St. Stephen's Chapel, and apparently without any public inconvenience. Walpole is probably the first since the Revolution, who, on system, confined himself to the House of Commons, as his proper or as the principal sphere. In fact, a House of Commons elected for three years could not have that degree of stability or combination, which would enable it to enter into any successful competition either with the Peers or with the King. Bound fast by the fears of their approaching elections, they could sel-

\* Mr. Hallam observes: "Nothing can be more extravagant than what is sometimes confidently pretended by the ignorant, that the Legislature exceeded its rights by this enactment, or, if that cannot legally be advanced, that it at least violated the trust of the people and broke in upon the ancient constitution." (*Constitut. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 316.)

† Communicated by Sir George Colebrooke. See Cox's Walpole, vol. i. p. 75.

dom either exert the power or obtain the reputation which belong to independence. We may also observe, that the same short tenure, which, in one state of public feeling, renders the House of Commons too weak as towards the King and the Peers, would, in another state of public feeling, make it too weak as towards the violent democracy. Combined with a system of pledges, and with the choice of needy adventurers, we may conceive how triennial elections might utterly degrade the dignity of a representative, and turn him into a mere tool and puppet of popular caprice; nor is it a little amusing to see how some of the loudest bawlers for freedom would willingly bow beneath the yoke, and stoop to a degree of personal bondage, far more galling and shameful than any that ever aroused their sympathy for others.

The Ministers determined that their proposed Bill should originate in the House of Lords. It was there that they felt least sure of a majority; and they wished, that, in case of failure, their friends in the Commons should not at least incur needless unpopularity, nor lose ground at the ensuing elections. Accordingly, on the 10th of April, a Bill for the repeal of the Triennial Act was brought in by the Duke of Devonshire.\* It was of course keenly opposed by the whole weight of the Opposition, yet their numbers were less formidable than had been apprehended; and their chief division on the Bill going into Committee, gave them only 61 votes against 96.† Some remarks of the Earl of Isla in supporting the Bill, though certainly exaggerated, might perhaps have deserved some attention in the remodelling of our representative system, as showing the dangers of a mere pecuniary qualification, and its fluctuation according to the changes in the precious metals. "For," said he, "forty shillings a year in freehold, which qualifies a man to vote in elections, was formerly as good as forty pounds

\* This was William, the second Duke, at that time Lord Steward of the Household; he succeeded in 1707, and died in 1729. (Collins's Peerage, vol. i. p. 355.) His father had been one of the principal promoters of the Triennial Bill.

† See Parliamentary History, vol. vii. p. 305. How could Coxe assert that there were only 36 votes against it in the House of Lords? (Memoirs of Walpole, vol. i. p. 75.)

“is at present, so that formerly the electors were either gentlemen or men of substance, whereas now the majority of them are of the dregs of the people, and therefore more subject to corruption.” He was answered by Lord Peterborough, whose speech, however, as far as we have any record of it, consisted chiefly of a dull and elaborate sneer against the doctrine of the Trinity. The Duke of Buckingham, who spoke on the same side as Peterborough, made a far better and less excursive use of his wit. “The Triennial Act,” he owned, “is subject to some inconveniences; the best things are not exempt from them; but should we on that account repeal a good law and alter the constitution? Pray, my Lords, consider what you are doing! Why, to prevent robbing on the highway, you forbid travelling!”

Thirty Peers, members of the minority, signed a protest against this Bill; and it may be observed, that amongst the chief opponents of the Ministry were their former staunch supporters, the Dukes of Somerset and Shrewsbury. The estrangement of the former has already been explained; for that of the latter it might be difficult to account on any other ground than his usual versatility. He had, about a year before, resigned in disgust his office of Lord Chamberlain, alleging ill health, his favourite pretext, which was not yet worn out by the constant use of twenty years. But the truth is, as we find from the Stuart Papers, that at this time, or soon afterwards, he had embarked in the Jacobite intrigues.\*

The Septennial Bill, having passed the Lords, was sent down to the Commons, and read a second time on the 24th of April. Walpole being then severely indisposed†, was unable to take any part in support of the measure; but it had his full concurrence, and it was defended on the part of the Government by Secretary Stanhope, Craggs, Aislable, Lord Coningsby, and several others. “Ever since the Triennial Bill has been enacted,” said

\* “The Duke of Shrewsbury is frankly engaged, and was the last time I heard of him very sanguine.” Bolingbroke to the Pretender. August 20. 1715. Appendix.

† “My brother Walpole,” says Lord Townshend, “lay so ill that his life was despaired of.” To Stanhope, Oct. 16. 1716. Coxe’s Walpole.



Sir Richard Steele, "the nation has been in a series of contentions; the first year of a Triennial Parliament has been spent in vindictive decisions and animosities about the late elections; the second Session has entered into business; but rather with a spirit of contradiction to what the prevailing set of men in former Parliaments had brought to pass, than of a disinterested zeal for the common good; the third Session has languished in the pursuit of what little was intended to be done in the second; and the approach of an ensuing election has terrified the members into a servile management, according as their respective principals were disposed towards the question before them in the House. Thus the state of England has been like that of a vessel in distress at sea; the pilot and mariners have been wholly employed in keeping the ship from sinking; the art of navigation was useless, and they never pretended to make sail."

On the other hand, the cause of Triennial Parliaments did not want many able advocates, especially Sir Robert Raymond, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Bromley, the late Secretary of State, and Mr. Shippen, the rising leader of the Tories. "Long Parliaments," said the latter, "will naturally grow either formidable or contemptible . . . . There was a famous simile applied by Julian Johnson to the long Parliament of King Charles the Second — that a standing Parliament will always stagnate, and be like a country pond which is overgrown with duck's meat. I make no application; this present Parliament is so far from being a stagnating pool, that it might rather be compared to a rapid stream, or irresistible torrent." It is plain that Shippen here alludes to the violent proceedings against Oxford and Ormond.

The Ministers, on this occasion, were, moreover, opposed by their late Solicitor-General, Lechmere, who, as one of their friends testily observed at the time, "always damns every thing that does not originally come from himself."\* On a division, the Bill was committed by 284 votes against 162; and it should be noted, that meanwhile the people at large showed no disapprobation of the intended change. On referring to the Journals of

\* Mr. Moyle to Horace Walpole. Coxe's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 62.



the House of Commons\*, I find that the only petitions presented against it were from Marlborough, Midhurst, Hastings, the corporation of Cambridge, Abingdon, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Horsham, Westbury, Cardiff, and Petersfield; none of them places of much importance, and one half of them either mutilated or extinguished under the Reform Bill of 1832.

In Committee on the Bill Lechmere proposed a clause to disable such persons from becoming members of either House of Parliament as have pensions during pleasure. But Stanhope urged that such a clause would only clog the Bill and endanger its miscarriage, a part of it being an infringement on the privileges of the Peers; and he announced his intention of himself bringing in a separate Bill with reference to pensioners in the House of Commons. Accordingly, he over-ruled Lechmere's proposition (probably intended as a stratagem for defeating the Septennial Bill altogether); and the same evening he moved for leave to bring in a Bill to disable any person from being chosen a member of, or sitting or voting in, the House of Commons, who has any pension during pleasure, or for any number of years, from the Crown. This Bill was accordingly prepared, and ordered to be brought in by Stanhope, Craggs, and Boscawen, and it passed on the 8th of June.† As for the Septennial Bill, it was read a third time on the 26th of April, the minority mustering no more than 121.

We are told, apparently on very good authority, that during the progress of the Septennial Bill, the great Lord Somers rallied for a few hours from his paralytic complaint; and that his brilliant intellect, so long overcast by sickness, shone forth from amidst the clouds. Lord Townshend, being apprised of the change, immediately waited upon the venerable statesman, who, as soon as he saw him enter the room, embraced him, and said, "I have just heard of the work in which you are engaged, and congratulate you upon it. I never approved of the Triennial Bill, and always considered it in effect the reverse of what it was intended. You have my hearty approbation in this business; and I

\* Journals, vol. xviii. p. 429, &c.

† Comm. Journ. vol. xviii. p. 460.

"think it will be the greatest support possible to the "liberty of the country."\* This judgment, however, will probably weigh only with such as were already of the same opinion; others will find it easy to reconcile a love of Triennial Parliaments with a veneration for Lord Somers, by doubting, not unfairly, whether his short intervals from sickness did really restore the full use of his faculties. These, however, are the last public sentiments recorded of that illustrious man. He expired on the 26th of April, leaving behind him a name ever to be held in reverence, so long as an enlightened love of liberty or a profound knowledge of law, the most statesmanlike wisdom or the most inflexible integrity, are understood and upheld amongst mankind. He was born in 1650, at Worcester, his father being an attorney in that city.† In his childhood he is said to have displayed all the application and seriousness of a man.‡ In his manhood he certainly showed all the gentleness and softness of a child.§ Yet his passions were naturally angry and impetuous, as is gladly alleged by his enemies, who do not perceive that this fact, which they intend as blame, in reality, conveys the highest panegyric on his temper and self-command.|| Being bred to the Bar, he soon became eminent in his profession, but did not confine himself to

\* This anecdote was communicated by the first Lord Sydney and Mr. Charles Townshend, who had it from their father. (Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 76.) A nearly similar story is recorded of Lord Somers in the preceding year, when he lamented the impeachment of Queen Anne's ministers, and compared it to the proscriptions of Marius and Sylla.

† Shrewsbury Correspondence, p. 389. This Mr. Somers was agent to the Talbot property. Swift calls him "a noted rogue" (vol. x. p. 303.).

‡ See a character by Dr. Birch, in Seward's Anecdotes, vol. ii. p. 249. ed. 1804.

§ "He was," says Burnet, "fair and gentle perhaps to a fault, considering his post" (vol. ii. p. 107. ed. folio). This is admitted even by Swift: "I have hardly known any man with talents more proper to acquire and preserve the favour of a Prince; never offending in word or gesture; in the highest degree courteous and complaisant." *Four Last Years* (Works, vol. v. p. 171.).

|| See Swift's Works, vol. x. p. 303. The Dean adds, "I allow him to have possessed all excellent qualifications except virtue." In Swift's vocabulary "virtue" means faction.

it; and in some political writings forcibly and fearlessly inveighed against the arbitrary measures of the Court. In the memorable trial of the Seven Bishops, he acted as their counsel: in the Convention Parliament he was chosen a representative of his native city; and both in his place in the Commons, and as one of the managers of the conferences with the Lords, actively promoted the great work of the Revolution. He was soon after made Solicitor-General—became, in 1692, Attorney-General; and in 1693 Lord Keeper. In 1697 he was still further promoted to a peerage and the office of Lord Chancellor—honours which, so far from soliciting, he was with great difficulty persuaded to accept when proffered. In all these employments he maintained the same serene and lofty character—neither arrogant to his inferiors nor servile to the King. But all his merit could not shield him from the usual vicissitudes of popularity; and he found, as Shrewsbury afterwards observed in a letter to himself, that “ours is a country that will not be served;” “satisfied neither with those in affairs nor with those who decline them.”\* In 1701 he was assailed by a Parliamentary impeachment, chiefly for his share in the Treaty of Partition; and so formidable was the outcry against him, that King William, well as he knew his innocence, and highly as he prized his services, had, even before his trial, found it necessary to deprive him of the Seals. His personal mortifications, however, never drove him into political rancour. He remained for several years in dignified exclusion from office, observing rather than opposing the Government, and dividing his time between the duties of a peerage and the pursuits of science. In the former he was considered a leader of his party; in the latter he was chosen President of the Royal Society. He is one of those to whose exertions the Union with Scotland is principally due. In 1708 he became President of the Council to the great Whig Administration. In 1710 he resigned with the rest of his colleagues, and was again conspicuous in the ranks of opposition. But age and infirmities were now creeping upon him, and he suffered from paralytic attacks, which

\* Letter from Rome, July 5. 1704.

have been ascribed to perhaps the only blemish in his private life—an excessive passion for women.\* His great faculties gradually sunk from their former energy into torpor, and from torpor into imbecility; and at his death he had for some time survived the powers of his mind. In the whole range of our history, I know not where to find a more upright and unsullied public character than that of Somers. He had contracted nothing of the baseness and venality of his age. He had touched pitch, and was not defiled. In the words of Horace Walpole, he was one of those divine men, who, like a chapel in a palace, remain unprofaned, while all the rest is tyranny, corruption, and folly. He had all the knowledge, but none of the pedantry, of his profession. He loved the law of England, not as too many seem to love it, merely for the sake of the dross that defiles it—for the gibberish which still clings to its language—for the mummeries into which some of its forms have grown. He loved the law of England as the armoury from which, when threatened either by democracy or by despotism, we may draw our readiest weapons, and which may prevent recourse to any others. In foreign affairs he was no less deeply skilled, having most attentively studied the balance of power, and the political interests of Europe. As a speaker, his reasoning was close and powerful, his diction flowing and manly. The natural warmth of his temper, which he so successfully mastered in politics, glowed unrestrained in his attachment to his friends; and as no man was ever more deserving of the veneration of posterity, so no one was ever more beloved in private life.

During the time that the Ministers were carrying the Septennial Act and their other measures through Parliament, they had another struggle, almost as important and far more difficult to maintain, at Court. The King's impatience to revisit his German dominions could no longer be stemmed. It was in vain that his confidential

\* On this point we should utterly disregard such libels as those of Mrs. Manley. (*New Atlantis*, vol. iv. p. 56, &c.) But it seems to me that an impartial writer is compelled, however reluctantly, to admit the testimony of Lord Somers's own kinsman and admirer, Mr. Cooksey. (*Observations*, &c. p. 28.)

advisers pointed out to him the unpopularity that must attend, and the dangers that might follow, his departure at such a crisis; their resistance only chafed instead of curbing His Majesty, and at length the Ministers let go the reins. Two great obstacles, however, still remained to delay his journey—first, the restraining clause in the Act of Settlement; and, secondly, his jealousy of the Prince of Wales, whom, in his absence, it would be indispensable to invest with some share at least of power and sovereign authority.

As to the first of these difficulties, it might have been met in two modes; by proposing to Parliament either an occasional exception, or a total repeal of the restraining clause. The former would certainly have been the more safe and constitutional course, but the latter was thought the most respectful, and accordingly preferred. Accustomed as George was to foreign habits, and attached to his Hanoverian subjects, his ardent desire to visit them should be considered a misfortune indeed to our country, yet by no means a blemish in his character. But it certainly behoved the Legislature to hold fast the invaluable safeguard which they already possessed against his foreign partialities. It might, therefore, be supposed by a superficial observer, that the repeal of the restraining clause, when proposed by Sir John Cope in the House of Commons, would have been encountered with a strenuous opposition. On the contrary, it passed without a single dissentient voice; the Whigs and the friends of Government supporting the wishes of the King, and the Tories delighted at the prospect that His Majesty's departure would expose his person to unpopularity and his affairs to confusion.

The jealousy which George the First entertained of his son was no new feeling. It had existed even at Hanover, and been since inflamed by an insidious motion of the Tories in the House of Commons, that, out of the Civil List, 100,000*l.* should be allotted as a separate revenue for the Prince of Wales. The motion was over-ruled by the Ministerial party, and its rejection offended the Prince as much as its proposal had the King. In fact, it is remarkable as a peculiarity either of representative government, or of the House of Hanover, that, since the power



of the House of Commons has been thoroughly established, and since that family has reigned, the heirs apparent have always been on ill terms with the sovereign. There have been four Princes of Wales since the death of Anne, and all the four have gone into bitter Opposition. "That family," said Lord Carteret, one day in full Council, "always has quarrelled, and always will quarrel from generation to generation."

Such being His Majesty's feelings, he was unwilling to intrust the Prince with the government in his absence, unless by joining other persons in the commission, and limiting his power by the most rigorous restrictions. Through the channel of Bernsdorf, his principal favourite, he communicated his idea to the members of the Cabinet, and desired them to deliberate upon it. The answer of Lord Townshend to Bernsdorf is still preserved.\* He first eagerly seized the opportunity of recapitulating in the strongest manner the objections to the King's departure, and then proceeded to say, that the Ministers having carefully perused the precedents, found no instance of persons being joined in commission with the Prince of Wales, and few, if any, of restrictions upon such commissions; and that they were of opinion, "that the constant tenour of ancient practice could not conveniently be receded from." Under such circumstances, the King found it impossible to persevere in his design. Instead, however, of giving the Prince the title of Regent, he named him Guardian of the Realm and Lieutenant—an office unknown in England since the days of the Black Prince.† He also insisted that the Duke of Argyle, whom he suspected of abetting and exciting his son in ambitious views, and who, as Groom of the Stole to the Prince, had constant and easy access to his person, should be dismissed from that and all his other employments. Having thus settled, or rather unsettled, matters, George began his journey on the 9th of July, and was attended by Stan-

\* It is dated May 19., and printed in Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 51.

† There were, moreover, several restrictions imposed upon the authority of the Prince of Wales. They are dated July 5. 1716, and may be seen in Coxe's MSS. vol. lvi. Brit. Mus.



hope; the other Secretary, Lord Townshend, being detained by the pregnancy of his wife in England.

It cannot be denied that at this period the popularity of George the First was by no means such as might have been expected from his judicious choice of Ministers, or from his personal justice and benevolence of disposition. These qualities, indeed, were not denied by the multitude, but they justly complained of the extreme rapacity and venality of his foreign attendants. Coming from a poor Electorate, a flight of hungry Hanoverians, like so many famished vultures, fell with keen eyes and bended talons on the fruitful soil of England. Bothmar and Bernsdorf, looking to the example of King William's foreign favourites, expected peerages and grants of land, and were deeply offended at the limitations of the Act of Settlement. Robethon, the King's private secretary, whilst equally fond of money, was still more mischievous and meddling; he was of French extraction, and of broken fortunes: a prying, impertinent, venomous creature, for ever crawling in some skiny intrigue. All these, and many others, even down to Mahomet and Mustapha, two Turks in his Majesty's service, were more than suspected of taking money for recommendations to the King, and making a shameful traffic of his favour.

But by far the greatest share of the public odium fell upon the King's foreign mistresses. The chief of these, Herrengard Melesina Von Schulenburg, was created by His Majesty Duchess of Munster in the Irish peerage, and afterwards Duchess of Kendal in the English. She had no great share of beauty; but with George the First a bulky figure was sufficient attraction. To intellect she could make still less pretension. Lord Chesterfield, who had married her niece, tells us that she was little better than an idiot; and this testimony is confirmed by the curious fact, that one morning, after the death of her Royal lover, she fancied that he flew into her window in the form of a raven, and accordingly gave the bird a most respectful reception. She affected great devotion, and sometimes attended several Lutheran chapels in the course of the same day; perhaps with the view of countenancing a report which prevailed, though I believe without foundation, that the King had married her with

the left hand, according to the German custom. Her rapacity was very great and very successful. After the resignation of the Duke of Somerset, no Master of the Horse was appointed for several years, the profits of the place being paid to the Duchess; and there is no doubt that her secret emoluments for patronage and recommendations far surpassed any outward account of her receipts. Sir Robert Walpole more than once declared of her (but this was after the death of George the First), that she would have sold the King's honour for a shilling advance to the best bidder.

The second mistress, Sophia Baroness Kilmanseck, created Countess of Darlington, was younger and more handsome than her rival; but, like her, unwieldy in person, and rapacious in character. She had no degree either of talent or information, it being apparently the aim of George, in all his amours, to shun with the greatest care the overpowering dissertations of a learned lady.\*

\* This sort of feeling is well expressed in the pretended memoirs of Madame du Barry, "*J'aimais à les voir*," she says of two block-heads; "*leur entretien me reposait l'imagination*." (Vol. I. p. 147.)

## CHAPTER VII.

THE journey of the King from England was marked by important negotiations in foreign affairs, and by a violent schism in the domestic administration. Both of these, as involving in no ordinary degree the safety of the country and the character of its principal statesmen, require from the historian a particular detail.

It has already been noticed, that at the accession of George the First, he had not a single secure ally but the States-General, and his son-in-law, the King of Prussia. Even the latter was frequently estranged from him, and every other power in Europe seemed either indifferent or hostile. The Pretender, backed by a large party at home, stationed in Lorraine, as on a neighbouring watch-tower, ready to descend at every favourable opportunity, and secretly assisted with gold from Spain and arms from France, had, since that time, shaken the state to its foundations in a most dangerous rebellion. Nor had the suppression of that rebellion by any means quelled the spirit or blasted the hopes of his party. It was every where raising its head, and preparing for a fresh attempt; whilst, on the other hand, the people at large were murmuring at the oppressive and unwonted burden of a standing army, which, therefore, it seemed equally dangerous to disband or to maintain. On the whole, it plainly appeared that it was hopeless to expect any restoration of quiet and security, unless France, our nearest and most formidable neighbour, and the power that could afford by far the greatest aid to the Pretender, should be effectually detached from his cause.

Now, to effect this necessary object, either of two plans might be pursued. The first and most obvious was to follow up the principles of the Grand Alliance, and form a close connection with the States-General and the Emperor, so as to compel France to dismiss the Pretender, and his principal partisans, Mar and Ormond, from all

her dominions or dependencies. But to this course there were strong, and indeed invincible, objections. The protracted struggle of the Cabinets of Vienna and the Hague, with respect to the Barrier Treaty, and the bitter animosity which had thereby arisen on both sides, prevented any close and cordial union between them. Nor was the Emperor friendly to King George, as Elector of Hanover; he viewed with peculiar jealousy the claims upon Bremen and Verden, which will presently be noticed; and without relinquishing these, it would have been impossible at that juncture to enter into a thorough concert of measures with the Cabinet of Vienna. The States-General, it is true, had no such jealousy; but their administration, once so active and able, was daily lapsing more and more into weakness and imbecility: "it is now," says Horace Walpole, the British Minister at the Hague\*, "a many-headed, headless Government, containing as many masters as minds." Their torpid obstinacy, which had so often defied even the master-mind of Marlborough, was far beyond the control of any other English minister. Besides, what sufficient inducements could be held out to them or to the Emperor for incurring the hazard of another war? Would the Catholics of Vienna be so very zealous for the service of the Protestant Succession? Would the Austrian politicians—at all times eminently selfish—consider the banishment of the Pretender from France as more than a merely English object? Would they risk every thing to promote it? Why, even when their own dearest interests were at issue—when the monarchy of Spain was the stake—they had shown a remarkable slackness and indifference. "We look upon the House of Austria," said Lord Bolingbroke, in 1711, "as a party who sues for a great estate *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*."† And he adds elsewhere: "I never think of the conduct of that family without recollecting the image of a man braiding a rope of hay, whilst his ass bites it off at the other end."‡ On the whole, there-

\* See his Life by Coxe, p. 12.

† To Mr. Drummond, August 7. 1711.

‡ To Mr. Drummond, January 5. 1711. Marlborough himself was sometimes provoked into similar expressions: — "The Emperor

fore, it appeared in 1716, that the utmost to which the States-General and the Emperor could be brought, was a defensive alliance with England, in case of aggression from France or other powers; and such alliances were accordingly concluded with Holland on the 6th of February, and with the Emperor on the 25th of May, with a mutual guarantee of territory\*; but these still left the desired removal of the Pretender and his adherents unaccomplished.

It became necessary, therefore, to consider the second plan for attaining this great object; namely, by treaty and friendly union with France herself. Nor were there wanting, since the death of Louis the Fourteenth, many circumstances highly favourable to such views. The Regent Duke of Orleans had, in nearly all respects, adopted a different political course. So long, indeed, as the Jacobites were in arms in Scotland, he clung to the hope of the restoration of the Stuarts; or, in other words, the establishment in England of an entirely French policy. But the suppression of the rebellion and the return of the Pretender having dissipated, or at least delayed, all such hopes, and the Regent considering the new Government of England as more firmly established, seriously turned his mind to the advantage which might arise to him from a friendly union with it. Besides the public interests of France, he had also personal objects at stake; and he looked to the chance of his own succession to the throne. Not that he had even for a single moment, or in the slightest degree, formed any design against the rights of Louis the Fifteenth; with all his failings (and he had very many) in private life, he was certainly a man of honour in public, and nothing could be more pure and above reproach than his care of his infant sovereign. But he might fairly and justly contemplate the possibility that the life of a sickly boy might prematurely end; on which event the Regent would have become the legitimate heir, since the birthright of Philip the Fifth of Spain had been solemnly renounced. It was, however, generally understood, that in such a case Philip was not "is in the wrong in almost everything he does." To Lord Sunderland, June 27. 1707.

\* See Lamberty, *Mém.* vol. ix. p. 395. and p. 471.

disposed to be bound by his renunciation; and, in fact, in his position, he might disclaim it with some show of plausibility, since his own rights upon the Spanish Crown were only founded upon the invalidity of a renunciation precisely similar. His grandmother, the Infanta Maria Theresa, on her marriage with the King of France, had in the most solemn manner, for herself and her descendants, renounced all claim to the Crown of Spain. Yet her grandson was now reigning at Madrid. How could, then, that grandson be expected cordially to concur in the principle that renunciations are sacred and inviolable, and cheerfully forego the sceptre of France if once placed within his grasp?

Foreseeing this opposition, and not without apprehensions that the King of Spain might, meanwhile, attempt to wrest the Regency from his hands, the Duke of Orleans was anxious to provide himself with foreign support, and knew that none could be stronger than a guarantee from England of the succession to the House of Orleans. For this object he was willing, on the part of France, to make corresponding concessions. Such a guarantee would also, not merely thus indirectly, but in itself, be highly advantageous to England, as tending to prevent that great subject of apprehension, the union of the French and Spanish Crowns upon the same head. Thus, then, the Cabinet of St. James and the Palais Royal had, at this period, each a strong interest to enter into friendly and confidential relations with each other. This was first perceived and acted upon by the Regent. Townshend\* and Stan-

\* Coxe tells us in his *Memoirs of Walpole*, that "Townshend was the original adviser and promoter of the French treaty, and had gradually surmounted the indifference of the King, the opposition of Sunderland, and the disapprobation of Stanhope." But this statement in his first volume (p. 98.) is disproved by the documents published by himself in the second. On Aug. 17. 1716, Old Style, Mr. Poyntz writes to Stanhope, "His Majesty knows that Lord Townshend has long been of opinion that any further engagements with the Regent, particularly with respect to the succession, would only serve to strengthen the Regent, and to put it in his power to do the King greater mischief." And Lord Townshend himself, in his letter to the King, of November 11. 1716, Old Style, expressly limits the period when he began to approve and forward this French treaty to the time when the Abbé Dubois was first sent by the Regent to the Hague.



hope were for some time reluctant to enter into a close alliance with their ancient enemies; but gradually saw its expediency, and without much difficulty prevailed upon the King, who, very soon, as we shall find in the sequel, became still more anxious for it than themselves.

Another matter of negotiation between France and England, which had commenced even under the reign of Louis the Fourteenth, was the question of Mardyke. By the treaty of Utrecht Louis had bound himself to demolish the port at Dunkirk. This he had accordingly performed; but, at the same time, he had begun a new canal at Mardyke, upon the same coast, which works produced a great ferment in England, and became the immediate subject of remonstrance with the Court of Versailles.\* On the one hand, it was urged that such a construction was an evident breach of the spirit, if not the letter, of the treaty; and that the plenipotentiaries at Utrecht, when they stipulated the demolition of Dunkirk, never could have intended that another and a better harbour should be opened in its neighbourhood. On the other side, it was answered that Mardyke was not Dunkirk; that the King of France had faithfully performed his agreement; and that, having done so, there was nothing in the Treaty of Utrecht to deprive him of the natural right of a sovereign to construct any works he pleased within his own dominions. Beyond such counter-statements very little progress was made in the negotiation; and it seemed probable that the French might be enabled to profit by the gross negligence of the British plenipotentiaries in not expressly guarding against such a contingency in a separate article. But when the Regent became anxious for the friendship of England, he saw the necessity of yielding much, if not all, of his pretensions at Mardyke. He withdrew the negotiation from the reluctant and unfriendly management of M. de Chateauneuf, the French Resident at the Hague, and he determined to intrust it to his own most confidential adviser, the Abbé† Dubois.

\* See Lord Stair's Journal at Paris, in the Hardwicke State Papers, vol. ii. p. 528.

† I used the word Abbé as most consistent with the present custom, although I believe that in sterling English writing the word Abbot

The Abbé Dubois, afterwards Cardinal and Prime Minister, was at this time sixty years of age. His father was a poor apothecary, near Limoges. Young Dubois came to Paris in hopes of a bursarship at a college; but failing in this object, he combined an opportunity for learning with the means of livelihood by acting as servant to the Principal. He afterwards became tutor in the family of a tradesman named Maroy; and it is a curious fact, that young Maroy, who in the days of his poverty had been his pupil, in the days of his greatness became one of his postilions. A more favourable turn of fortune afterwards assigned to Dubois a subaltern post in the education of the Duke of Chartres, and the prince and the preceptor soon became inseparable friends. A ready wit, undaunted assurance, and sagacious counsels, recommended Dubois, who, moreover, did not scruple to augment his favour by the most shameful services. His agency triumphed over the virtue of rustic beauties, and introduced them by stealth into the apartments of the young Duke, at the Palais Royal; and, unlike some other teachers, Dubois always followed in his own conduct the same maxims which he prescribed or permitted to his pupil. On completing this excellent education, the venerable ecclesiastic was for some time attached to the embassy of Marshal Tallard in England, but he always continued his connection with the Palais Royal, and was looked upon by the Duke of Chartres, then of Orleans, as one of his surest and most steady counsellors. He adhered to that prince through good report and ill report; and, on returning, directed the political course of His Royal Highness with the highest degree of foresight and sagacity. His profligate character was, however, so notorious, that when Philip

should be employed to denote not only the real superior of a monastery, but also the titular distinction common amongst the French clergy. I find it used in the latter sense by the best writers of the best times of our literature, in the lively letters of Lady M. W. Montagu (vol. i. p. 97, &c. ed. 1820), the grave despatches of Bolingbroke (To Lord Strafford, March 7. 1712), and the masterly memoirs of Clarendon (Life, vol. iii. p. 356, &c. Oxf. ed.). I take the liberty of mentioning these authorities, having formerly been termed "a bigoted purist" for my use of the word Abbot in the War of the Succession (Edin. Review, No. cxii. p. 499.).

became Regent, it was not without much opposition and clamour that he could appoint him a counsellor of state. The Regent's own words on that occasion show his true opinion of his favourite: "Let me beg of you, my dear "Abbé, to be a little honest!"\*

The gross vices of Dubois, and his shamelessness in the high ecclesiastical dignities which he afterwards attained, have justly made his name infamous with later times. But they have also, less justly perhaps, dimmed his great reputation for talents. Where any one quality stands forth very prominently from a character either for good or evil, posterity in general confine their attention to that alone, and merge every other in it. We remember that Dubois was most unprincipled—we forget that he was most able. It would be difficult to name another French statesman of the last century who more thoroughly understood at once the foreign relations and the domestic administration of his country, or who brought more skill, resolution, and activity to promote them, whenever they were combined with his own aggrandisement. We cannot but admire the vigour of an intellect which was never unnerved either by poverty in youth or by pleasure in old age; which triumphed over all his rivals for power; and raised him at length, a priest without religion and a politician without honour, to the highest pinnacles of the Church and of the State!

In explanation of this remarkable phenomenon, we may also observe, that even in the smallest trifles, this accomplished knave had trained every faculty to the purpose of penetrating the thoughts of others, and concealing his own. Thus, for example, he had accustomed himself to a slight stammer in conversation, with the view of never being discomposed by any sudden question, and of gaining a few moments for reflection without appearing to pause.† Let us observe, likewise, that, not-

\* "L'Abbé, un peu de droiture je t'en prie." (Sevelinges, *Mémoires Secrets du Cardinal Dubois*, 2 vols. Paris, 1814.) This is a very valuable work, compiled from the MS. correspondence of Dubois. I have found it particularly useful for the negotiations at Hanover and the Hague. It should be compared with the English documents printed in Coxe's Walpole.

† *Mém. de St. Simon*, vol. xii. p. 190. ed. 1829.

withstanding his brilliant success, Dubois was anything but happy. "Would to Heaven," said he to Fontenelle, when in the fulness of his power, "that I were now living in a garret, with a single servant, and fifteen hundred francs a year!"

It was Dubois whom the Regent selected for the negotiation with England, not only on account of his superior dexterity, but also because, during his former residence in that country, he had had the advantage of forming a personal acquaintance, and even friendship, with Secretary Stanhope. He was therefore instructed to proceed to the Hague, at the time of King George's passage, under the pretence of buying books and pictures, and to endeavour, without any ostensible character, to see Stanhope, and to sound the intentions of the English Cabinet. Dubois fulfilled this mission with his usual address: he had several interesting conferences with Stanhope\*, and convinced himself that, though there were still many difficulties and prejudices in the way of a treaty, yet that they should not be considered as insuperable.

On hearing this opinion, and reading the minutes of what took place at the Hague, the Regent determined to employ Dubois in prosecuting what he had ably begun, and to send him on a second and more decisive mission. The Abbé accordingly set off for Hanover, which he reached on the 19th of August. He was still without any public character, concealed his name, and lodged at Stanhope's house.† In his first interviews with that Minister, he endeavoured, by every artifice, to entrap his adversary, and obtain some advantage in the negotiation.

\* July, 1716. See the *Mémoires Secrets de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 189—208., for an ample detail of these conferences, taken from the minutes of Dubois.

† Hanover was at that period not a little overflowing with strangers. Lady M. W. Montagu describes the scene in her usual lively style: "The vast number of English crowds the town so much, it is very good luck to get one sorry room in a miserable tavern. I dined to-day with the Portuguese ambassador, who thinks himself very happy to have two wretched parlours in an inn. . . . The King's company of French comedians play here every night: they are well dressed, and some of them not bad actors. His Majesty dines and sups constantly in public." To the Countess of Bristol, Nov. 25. 1716.

Thus, at the outset, he offered none but very insufficient expedients with respect to Mardyke, proposing little more than to alter the sluices, whilst the same depth of water was still to be preserved; and attempting to perplex the whole matter by a great bundle of draughts and other papers, which he had brought with him. Stanhope, in answer, expressed himself determined not to recede in any respect from his original demand. "As to the succession to the throne of France," says Stanhope, "I offered to draw up an article with him, expressing His Majesty's guarantee of the same to the Duke of Orleans in as strong terms as he could suggest; but when we came close to the point, I found that, notwithstanding the guarantee of this succession be the only true and real motive which induces the Regent to seek His Majesty's friendship, yet the Abbé was instructed rather to have it brought in as an accessory to the treaty, than to have an article so framed as to make it evident that was his only drift and intent. He insisted, therefore, very strongly for three days, that His Majesty should in this treaty guarantee the Treaty of Utrecht, the 6th article of which treaty contains every thing which relates to the succession of the Crown of France."\* It might easily be shown how much embarrassment and danger would have resulted to the new Government of England, had they been unwarily drawn in to accept this insidious proposal, and to guarantee the whole treaty so shamefully concluded by their predecessors. Stanhope accordingly met this request with a positive refusal. "The Abbé, finding me thus peremptory, talked of going away immediately, which threat I bore very patiently; but, thinking better of it, he brought himself to be satisfied, if an article should be inserted to guarantee the 4th, 5th, and 6th articles of the Treaty of Utrecht between France and England, and the 31st between France and Holland, the two former of which relate only to the succession of England, and the two latter contain every thing which concerns that of France, and the renuncia-

\* Despatch from Secretary Stanhope to Lord Townshend, dated Aug. 24. 1716, and printed in Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 68—72. It contains a full account of the whole negotiation at Hanover. See also the *Mémoires de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 213—221.



"tions upon which it is founded." This scheme not being liable to the same objections as the former, Stanhope drew up an article accordingly, and laid it before the King, who approved of it, and desired him to endeavour to bring Dubois to consent to it, "which, however," adds Stanhope, "it has cost me three days' wrangling to do."

As to the Jacobite cause, the Abbé made no difficulties, but offered three expedients, by which the Pretender would be sent beyond the Alps, either before or immediately after the ratification of the treaty. Reserving the option of one of these, and leaving the article of Mardyke to be determined in England, the preliminaries were conditionally signed by Stanhope and Dubois, and immediately forwarded both to London and to the Hague, it having been intended from the first that the treaty should, if possible, be a triple one, so as to include the Dutch; and they, on their part, eagerly entering into these views, and seeing the wisdom of closely adhering to the policy of England.\*

On receiving the preliminaries, Lord Townshend and Mr. Methuen, who acted as Secretary of State during Stanhope's absence, expressed entire satisfaction, and only doubted whether the Regent would ever consent to demolish Mardyke in the manner required.† Their first interview with M. Iberville, who was sent over from France to conclude that article with them, confirmed their apprehensions; "it being very plain," writes Mr. Poyntz, "by the course of the negotiation with him, that though the draining of the waters is made the pretence, yet the maintaining a depth sufficient to admit men-of-war and privateers is the real aim of the French."‡ But three days more entirely changed the scene. "My Lord Townshend and Mr. Methuen make no doubt but

\* Lord Townshend even complained of their being too anxious to treat — "that forward disposition which appears in too many there for negotiating with France." Mr. Poyntz to Secretary Stanhope, Sept. 8. 1716, O. S. Coxe's Walpole.

† Mr. Poyntz's despatch to Secretary Stanhope, Aug. 21. 1716, O. S., printed in Coxe's Walpole.

‡ Despatch to Secretary Stanhope, Sept. 8. 1716, O. S., printed in Coxe's Walpole.



“ you will be very much surprised to hear so soon, after  
“ what I had the honour to write to you in my last, that  
“ M. Iberville has given in a paper, by which he consents  
“ to ruin the FASCINAGES, and to reduce the sluice to the  
“ breadth of sixteen feet, which, in the opinion of the  
“ most skilful of our sea officers, as well as engineers, will  
“ more effectually exclude ships of war and privateers  
“ than what was first proposed in the paper annexed to  
“ His Majesty’s project. They impute this alteration in  
“ the conduct of the Regent partly to the perplexed state  
“ of his own affairs, and partly to his having a better  
“ opinion of His Majesty’s than heretofore. . . . . But,  
“ be the cause what it will, they think they have the  
“ justest cause to felicitate His Majesty on the conclusion  
“ of a treaty with France, as an event not more glorious  
“ in itself than advantageous in its consequences.”\* Thus,  
then, every obstacle to the French alliance seemed to  
be most happily removed, and nothing wanting to the  
treaty but its final ratification.

Meanwhile the state of the King’s relations with the  
northern powers was growing very critical. On coming  
to the Crown of England, His Majesty had by no means  
enlarged his views from the narrow bounds of the Elec-  
torate. His pride in his new dominions never at all  
diverted his thoughts, or slackened his zeal for merely  
Hanoverian objects. Amongst the foremost of these had  
always been the acquisition of the former Bishoprics of  
Bremen and Verden, rich districts, which, at the peace  
of Westphalia, had been secularised and ceded to Sweden,  
and ever since possessed by that power. But the daring  
and chivalrous spirit of Charles the Twelfth, now King of  
Sweden, as at first it had led him forward to victory, so at  
last drew upon him the depredations of all his neighbours.  
Danes, Norwegians, Saxons, Prussians, Muscovites — all  
gathered round to attack and despoil the fallen lion.  
Frederick the Fourth of Denmark especially had, in 1712,  
conquered Sleswick, Holstein, Bremen, and Verden;  
during which time Charles having fled into Turkey  
after his defeat at Pultawa, remained obstinately fixed

\* Mr. Poyntz to Secretary Stanhope, Sept. 11. 1716, O. S. Coxe’s  
Walpole.

at Bender, and showed a romantic pride in withstanding both the orders of the Sultan and the dictates of common sense. At length, however, starting from his lethargy to the defence of his dominions, he set off, travelled incognito through Germany, and suddenly arrived at his town of Stralsund, in November, 1714, before it was known there that he had even quitted Bender. His return made the enemies of Sweden tremble for their prey; and Frederick of Denmark, hopeless of retaining all the conquests he had made, determined to sacrifice a share, in order to secure the rest. With this view, he, in July, 1715, ratified a treaty with George as Elector of Hanover, by which he agreed to put Bremen and Verden in possession of his Electoral Highness, on condition that George should pay 150,000*l.*, and join the coalition against Sweden. Accordingly, in the autumn of that year, a British squadron, under Sir John Norris, had been sent into the Baltic, ostensibly to protect our trade from Swedish depredations, but with the real purpose of compelling Sweden to cede the provinces on the Weser, and accept a sum of money in compensation for them. Charles, however, was not dismayed—only the more exasperated—by these proceedings; and far from yielding to George, entered eagerly, as we shall afterwards find, into the Jacobite cabals against him.

It is to be observed that Townshend, Walpole, Stanhope, and, in fact, all the Ministers of George the First, entirely approved of his treaty with Denmark. Even after Townshend had left office in disgust, we find him, in a letter to Pensionary Slingeland, strongly urging his opinion that without any reference to the wishes of the King, and for the sake of England only, it was most desirable that Bremen and Verden should be wrested from Sweden and annexed to the Electorate.\* He might plausibly show the ill use which Sweden had often made of these territories—her usual connection with France—the consequent influence of both these States on the politics of the Empire—and the importance of the Elbe and Weser being open to British commerce. On these grounds it is certain that England had an interest in

\* See Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 87.

the cession. But it is no less certain that this interest was small, contingent, and remote ; and that if any other Prince than the Elector of Hanover had been King of England, the latter power would never have concluded such treaties, nor run such hazards for the aggrandisement of the former, with so slight a prospect of advantage to itself.

But the territories of Bremen and Verden were not the only points at issue : another storm seemed to be gathering in the North. The genius of Peter the Great had already begun to make his people, so lately unknown or despised, an object of jealousy to other European powers ; and one of his chief and most dangerous designs was to obtain a footing in the Empire. For this purpose he was disposed to avail himself of his alliance with the Duke of Mecklenburg, to whom he had given his niece in marriage, and of some differences which had sprung up in that country between the Duke and his subjects.\* He unexpectedly poured a large body of troops into the Duchy, and, on some remonstrances from Denmark, publicly threatened that he would quarter a part of them in the Danish territories. Such daring schemes of aggrandisement could not fail to be warmly resented both by the Emperor and by the smaller German sovereigns ; and George the First, being then at Hanover, was not among those least offended or alarmed. There was, moreover, great personal animosity between him and the Czar, though with scarcely any ground for it † ; but differences which have once arisen from trifling causes are generally found to be the stronger in proportion to the slightness of their origin. George sent his favourite counsellor, Bernsdorf, to Stanhope with a project “to crush the Czar “immediately ; to secure his ships, and even to seize his “person, to be kept till his troops shall have evacuated

\* I glide lightly over the obscure domestic affairs of Mecklenburg. Those who wish for further details may consult Lamberty, vol. v. p. 47. ; and, for the subsequent negotiations, vol. x. p. 107, &c., and the Hardwicke State Papers, vol. ii. p. 558.

† See St. Simon, vol. xv. p. 75. ed. 1829. “Cette haine,” he adds, “a duré toute leur vie et dans la plus vive aigreur.”—“The “Czar hates King George mortally,” writes Mr. G. Gyllenborg to Count Gyllenborg, Nov. 1716. (Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 402.)

"Denmark and Germany." Stanhope went directly to the King, whom he found very anxious that such orders should be sent to Sir John Norris. But Stanhope would consent to no further instructions than that Sir John should join his remonstrances with those of the King of Denmark, thus very properly avoiding any decisive steps until the matter could be referred to the other Ministers in England. To Lord Townshend he himself wrote thus:—"I shall check my own nature, which was ever inclined to bold strokes, till I can hear from you. But you will easily imagine how I shall daily be pressed to send orders to Sir John Norris. The truth is, I see no daylight through these affairs. We may easily master the Czar if we go briskly to work, and that this be thought a right measure. But how far Sweden may be thereby enabled to disturb us in Britain, you must judge. If the Czar be let alone, he will not only be master of Denmark, but, with the body of troops which he has still behind on the frontiers of Poland, may take quarters where he pleases in Germany. How far the King of Prussia is concerned with him we do not know, nor will that Prince explain himself. The King now wishes, and so does your humble servant, very heartily, that we had secured France. The Abbé (Dubois) talks to me as one would wish, and showed me part of a despatch from Marshal d'Huxelles this morning, whereby they promise that the minute our treaty is signed they will frankly tell us every thing they know touching the Jacobite projects from the beginning. I was, you know, very averse at first to this treaty; but I think truly, as matters now stand, we ought not to lose a minute in finishing it."\*

The contents of this letter gave no small uneasiness to the Cabinet in England. Lord Townshend, in an "absolutely secret" answer to Stanhope, expresses his fear that the prosecution of the northern war would be their ruin, and his opinion that peace ought immediately, even at some sacrifice, to be made with Sweden. In his public despatch, and speaking in the name not only of the other

\* Letter to Lord Townshend, dated September 25. 1716, N. S., and printed in Coxe's Walpole.

Ministers, but of the Prince of Wales, he represents the ill effects of a rupture with the Czar, more especially the seizing of the British merchants and ships in Russia, and the prohibiting the supply of naval stores from thence to England. That Norris's squadron should winter in the Baltic is also strongly objected to, above all, at a time when England was threatened with an invasion from Sweden and a rising from the Jacobites. "However," Townshend proceeds, "His Royal Highness, on the other hand, is no less deeply affected with a just sense of the imminent danger which these kingdoms, as well as the Empire, are exposed to from the behaviour of the Czar, who, it is plain, intends to make himself master of the whole coast of the Baltic. . . . On the whole, His Royal Highness is of opinion that His Majesty, if he thinks the King of Denmark able to go through with the project in question, may insinuate privately, and under the greatest secrecy, that he will not only acquiesce in His Danish Majesty's making this attempt, but that he will also support and assist him in the sequel of this affair when once this blow is given."

This modified proposal was by no means satisfactory to the King. He was chiefly intent on the continuance of his squadron in the Baltic; and Lord Townshend, knowing this to be His Majesty's wish, should at least have taken care to speak of it with temper. Yet, the following are the words of Poyntz, his private secretary, to Stanhope: "My Lord perceives, by a letter from M. Robethon, that the King is likely to insist on Sir John Norris's squadron being left to winter in the Baltic; and he commands me to acquaint you, that it makes him lose all patience to see what ridiculous expedients they propose to His Majesty for extricating themselves out of their present difficulties, as if the leaving you eight men of war to be frozen up for six months would signify five grains towards giving a new turn to the affairs of the North."\*

Meanwhile, at Hanover the designs of Russia continued

\* Despatch, dated Sept. 25. 1716, O. S. This despatch is not marked private, and was therefore (see Cox's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 56.) to be laid before the King. No wonder he complained of Lord Townshend's disrespectful tone.



to be watched with great anxiety. "There is reason to "believe," writes Stanhope to Townshend, on the 16th of October, "that the Duke of Mecklenburg has signed a "treaty with the Czar to give up his country to him "in exchange for Livonia, and other tracts of country "that way. Wismar, which is the strongest town and "best fortified in Germany, is at present garrisoned by "six battalions; two of the King's, two Danes, and two "Prussians. It is probable the Czar will immediately "invest that place, and God knows how far we may de- "pend upon either of the auxiliary presidaries, such is "the stupidity and knavery of both those Courts. . . . I "believe it may not be impossible to put this northern "business in such a light as may induce the Parliament "not to look on it with indifference. If I mistake not, "Cromwell, who understood very well the interest of "England with respect to foreign powers, fitted out more "than one fleet to the Baltic, with no other view than to "secure that, in the treaties of peace to be made betwixt "those northern potentates, a freedom of trade to the "Baltic should be preserved to all nations. He fre- "quently offered considerable sums of money to the King "of Sweden for Bremen. . . . It is certain, that if the "Czar be let alone three years, he will be absolute "master in those seas."

But to what result this alarming question might have tended can still only be matter of conjecture, for, happily, the apprehended crisis never came. The remonstrances which Sir John Norris had been instructed to make, combined with those of the Danish Court, and probably also of the Austrian agents, proved sufficient to deter the Czar from his projects against Mecklenburg, and induce him to re-embark the greater part of his troops; and thus was quietly averted an enterprise which it seemed almost equally dangerous for England to suffer or repel.

Whilst, however, the Russian expedition seemed to be impending, the King justly considered it of the utmost importance to lose no time in concluding his treaty with France. "Such was the impatience of some people," says Stanhope to Townshend, "that I assure you I have had "much ado for this fortnight last past to withstand the



“importunity of M. Bernsdorf\* and others, who pressed me to frame an article here with the Abbé (Dubois), touching Mardyke, and to send him with it to the Hague, with orders to Mr. Walpole to sign it; so apprehensive were they of your delays in England. I did resolutely withstand this.” But when, on the 6th of October, New Style, the article, as settled by Lord Townshend himself in England, reached Hanover, Stanhope, seeing no further objection, and impressed with the necessity of speedily closing with France, cheerfully complied with the King’s repeated injunctions, and signed the preliminary agreement with Dubois. It was at the same time agreed that the Abbé should immediately proceed to the Hague, and there sign the treaty in form with the English plenipotentiaries — General, lately created Lord, Cadogan, and Horace Walpole. To the latter Stanhope wrote as follows: — “I must recommend to you, by the best means you are able, to dispose the Pensionary and our other friends in Holland to give the greatest despatch to our business, that they also may be ready to sign without loss of time. But if you find that the forms of proceeding in Holland will occasion a necessary delay, I desire you will send me your opinion whether it will not then be the properest course for you to acquaint the Pensionary with the reasons His Majesty has to get the French tied down immediately by something under their hand, and for that purpose that you and the Abbé should sign the treaty; but with this express agreement on both sides, that the States are to be admitted into it as parties as soon as the necessary forms of their proceeding will allow them to come in.”† In

\* Bernsdorf had a strong personal interest in the Mecklenburg affair; his chief estate (three villages) being in that duchy. These three villages are described some years afterwards as still the main-spring of his political views. Lord Stanhope to Secretary Craggs, July 10. 1719. Appendix, vol. ii.

† Despatch, Oct. 6. 1716, N. S. Coxe’s Walpole, vol. ii. p. 98. The reader will find in another part of Coxe’s Walpole (vol. ii. p. 310.) a letter from Townshend to Stanhope, dated Sept. 15. 1716, and enclosing another from Lord Bolingbroke to Sir William Wyndham, according to which there seemed every reason to expect immediately a fresh attempt from the Jacobites. It seemed therefore of the utmost importance that the Pretender should be forced to cross the Alps as

a despatch to Secretary Methuen, Stanhope adds, that, in the King's opinion, the Dutch cannot possibly take it amiss, since the clause for their accession would fully secure their interests; that the full powers lodged at the Hague, and intended for the three governments' signing jointly, may possibly not be sufficient to authorise a separate signature; but that, in such a case, it was His Majesty's pleasure that proper powers should be forthwith sent from England.

It is to be observed, that during the whole progress of this negotiation, the British plenipotentiaries at the Hague had made frequent and positive assurances to the States that the treaty should not be finally concluded without including them. On the part of the States there was still no objection raised to the treaty itself, but it was found that the slowness of Dutch forms would prevent their signature for some time longer. Under these circumstances, it was the opinion of Stanhope that the urgency of northern affairs rendered it impossible to admit of such delay, and that the spirit of the engagement to the States would be fully and honourably performed by the clause which stipulated that they should, as soon afterwards as they pleased, be admitted as parties to the treaty. Such was also the view of the subject taken by Cadogan. But the second plenipotentiary, Horace Walpole, espoused the opposite sentiment with the utmost vehemence. "I cannot, for my life, see why the whole system of affairs in Europe should be entirely subverted on account of Mecklenburg. . . . I had rather starve, nay, die, than do a thing that gives such a terrible wound to my honour and conscience. . . . I should look upon it as no better than declaring myself a villain under my own hand. . . . I will lay my patent of reversion in the West Indies, nay, even my life, at His Majesty's feet, sooner than be guilty of such an action;" — these are amongst the expressions of his letters. He ended by an earnest request both to Stanhope and Townshend, that he might be permitted to return home, and leave the signing of the treaty to his colleague alone.

Whether the scruples of Horace Walpole in this in-soon as possible, and this still further explains the haste of the French treaty.

stance be thought well or ill founded, they at all events deserve that respect and esteem due even to the excess of honourable and punctilious feelings. It may, however, be questioned whether he is still entitled to the same praise when we find him, to relieve himself from his perplexing situation, secretly suggesting to his brother-in-law, Lord Townshend, the idea of raising up fictitious obstacles in the way of the King's orders for the utmost despatch. "Is it impossible," he asks, "that the unanswerable arguments of our friends in Holland, the contrary winds, the usual delays in passing powers under the Great Seal, or some other excuses that may be proper to be made to the Abbé, should prevent our signing with him before the States are ready?"\*

Lord Townshend, a man of the highest honour and probity, was utterly incapable of any such official treachery as pretending to obey whilst in reality opposing the injunctions of his sovereign. In his answer to Horace Walpole, through his secretary Poyntz, it is plainly declared, that though "his Lordship is entirely of your opinion as to the inconveniences that are to be apprehended from signing this treaty separately, yet he thinks you cannot well decline the King's positive commands; at least no relief is to be obtained against them from hence." Lord Townshend himself, in a subsequent letter of explanation to M. de Slingeland, condemns the idea of eluding the King's intentions as "a pitiful artifice and evasion."† By some singular accidents, however, his conduct bore a very great appearance of what he so strongly and so sincerely condemned. On the 28th of September he had written to Hanover, dissuading a separate signature; but admitting that, if it should be resolved upon, the powers already sent to the plenipotentiaries at the Hague would be quite sufficient for that purpose. Only four days afterwards he wrote again, saying that the powers were insufficient, and that new ones would be necessary, without, at the same time, giving his reasons for the change in his judgment. This omission, which proceeded only from haste or spleen, was not unnaturally imputed by the King and by Stanhope to

\* Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 105.

† Ibid. p. 159.

his concurrence in the views of Horace Walpole, and his determination to find pretexts for delay. Another incident now arose to strengthen and confirm these suspicions. The new full powers forwarded by Townshend were found to be drawn up in the most general and guarded terms, not making the slightest mention of the treaty with France, and seeming, therefore, as if they were purposely intended to avoid any thing like an approval or recognition of it from the British Cabinet. Abbé Dubois considered these powers much too loose and vague to be secure; he refused to sign the treaty upon them\*, and it became necessary again to send to England for fresh powers. Lord Townshend afterwards satisfactorily accounted for these suspicious circumstances in his conduct. "The full power," he says, "was conceived in general terms, including all particulars, and therefore, as was thought here, the better fitted to suit all unforeseen circumstances that might arise. . . . . Mr. Methuen himself concluded the treaty of Portugal in virtue of such a full power; and several others have done the like, without any one's making the objection now started by Abbé Dubois."† Subsequently, in a private letter, Lord Townshend adds, "Indeed, the true reason of my choosing to have them

\* "L'Abbé Dubois manda aussi-tôt au Duc d'Orléans qu'il était impossible de ne pas voir dans cet incident l'effet d'une intrigue ministérielle, dont le but était de prolonger la négociation jusqu'à l'ouverture du Parlement où l'on comptait bien la faire entièrement avorter." (Mém. de Sevelinges, vol. i. p. 229.) In a previous letter Dubois observed, "Que Lord Stanhope lui avait avoué que si la conclusion de l'alliance se remettait jusqu'à l'ouverture du Parlement d'Angleterre, l'autorité qu'il pouvait avoir dans la Chambre Basse et le crédit de Robert Walpole ne seraient pas suffisans pour empêcher l'opposition d'attaquer et même de faire rompre l'alliance." (Ibid. p. 223.)

† Letter to the King, Nov. 11. O. S. 1716. Coxe's Walpole. On the other hand, Stanhope, in his letter to Townshend of Nov. 11. N. S., complains, "Que l'on s'est écarté de la route commune, et des formes constamment usitées;" and this appears to be greatly confirmed by what passed at the Hague: "L'Abbé Dubois avait cependant offert de se contenter de ce plein pouvoir, pourvu que Lord Cadogan l'assurât par écrit qu'il était dans une forme usitée en Angleterre. Mais ce ministre s'était refusé à donner cette assurance." Mém. Secrets de Sevelinges, vol. i. p. 230.

"drawn in general terms was, that if the King should think it necessary to have his Ministers sign separately before those of the States, that separate instrument might, according to His Majesty's intentions, be afterwards perfectly sunk upon our signing all together, and no footsteps of any such order appear in the full powers whenever they should come to be made public together with the treaty."\* These explanations fully acquit Lord Townshend of any treacherous design. But when the news of Dubois' objection, and of the consequent difficulties and delays, reached Hanover, without any explanation at all from Lord Townshend, who, on the contrary, in his later despatches, studiously and pointedly abstained from noticing in any manner the signature of the preliminary agreement with Dubois, and who had even dropped a hint of his own resignation†, it is no wonder that both the King and Stanhope should have believed Lord Townshend to have completely espoused the views of Horace Walpole, and participated in the violent language of the latter. "All this together," writes Stanhope, "makes me think that what I have done here is so highly disapproved of, that special care is taken not to make a single step in acknowledgment of it, and that it will be for me alone to answer for what I did in pursuance of the King's repeated orders, on reasons which I consider most justly founded, and which I shall be ready to maintain against all those who may think proper to assail them."‡ On the whole, whilst fully admitting that Townshend's conduct was free from blame, I cannot but think the appearances against him so strong, as no less fully to justify the suspicion and resentment of Stanhope.

We are now come to the celebrated schism in the great Whig administration of George the First. Stanhope, under the influence of the feelings I have just mentioned, immediately went to the King (they were then at the hunting seat of Gohre), and tendered his resignation.

\* To M. Slingeland, Jan. 1. 1717, O. S. Coxe's Walpole.

† Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 126. and 117.

‡ Letter to Lord Townshend, Nov. 11. 1716, N. S. Coxe's Walpole.



The King, however, would by no means accept it, being scarcely less offended than himself at Lord Townshend's supposed behaviour, and having at the same time against that Minister and Robert Walpole other motives of displeasure, to which I have not yet alluded. With all his great merits (and I believe that there never lived a more upright and well-meaning man), it could scarcely be denied, even by Townshend's warmest partisans, that he was sometimes careless in business, violent and overbearing in manner. George the First, who seldom either neglected his affairs, or forgot his dignity, had early perceived these occasional deficiencies in his Minister; and, during his absence from England, they were frequently repeated and exaggerated to him by his German favourites.

With Walpole also the King was, at this time, seriously at variance as to some money for the Munster and Saxe-Gotha troops. These had, under the authority of Parliament, been taken into the British service, at the time of the Pretender's landing in Scotland. On the suppression of the rebellion there was no further occasion for these auxiliaries; still, however, the agreement having been already signed, it became necessary to make some payment in dismissing them. This the King had advanced from his own resources, but now declared that Walpole had promised him to make good the sum from the British treasury; whilst Walpole, on the other hand, was no less positive in "protesting before God that I cannot recollect "that ever the King mentioned one syllable of this to "me or I to him, but my memory must fail me when His "Majesty says the contrary."\* — There seems no need to impeach the recollection or the veracity of either the Monarch or the Minister. George the First could speak no English; Walpole could speak no French nor German: the only channel of communication between them was bad Latin, and nothing could be more probable than that they should misunderstand each other.

All these and several other grounds of dissatisfaction with the brother Ministers were improved to the best

\* Walpole to Stanhope, Nov. 11. 1716, O. S. Coxe's Walpole. See the treaties for the Munster and Saxe-Gotha troops in the Commons' Journals, March 28. 1717.



advantage by Baron Bothmar in England, and by the Duchess of Kendal at Hanover. The former, as Townshend vehemently declared, "has every day some infamous project or other on foot to get money;"\* in which he was most properly, but sometimes perhaps a little roughly and unguardedly, checked by that Minister. At this time especially, he appears to have had hopes of a considerable sum from the French lands in the island of St. Christopher, which had been ceded to England at the Peace of Utrecht†; and there is no doubt that his private correspondence with the King afforded him a full opportunity of retaliating upon those who caused his disappointment. The Duchess of Kendal, on her part, had undertaken, for what contemporaries term a "consideration," but posterity a "bribe," to obtain a peerage for Sir Richard Child, a Tory member of the House of Commons; and she was not a little displeased with Townshend for counteracting, or at least delaying, that measure, and representing to the King how greatly the interests of his administration would suffer from the promotion of a decided political opponent.

Another no less formidable antagonist of the Prime Minister remains to be mentioned in one of his own colleagues, Charles Earl of Sunderland, at this time Lord Privy Seal. It is remarkable how frequently that family has held a leading position in the councils of the empire.

\* Lord Townshend to Stanhope, Oct. 16. 1716, O. S. Coxe's Walpole. At a later period I find the following character of Bothmar in a letter from Craggs:—"C'est bien le plus faible raisonneur sur les affaires que j'aie à mon avis connu de ma vie. Quand les petits génies veulent faire les habiles gens ils ne manquent jamais de tomber dans la mauvaise foi, comme les femmes qui veulent malgré nature être spirituelles, se jettent à corps perdu dans la médiancée." To Mr. Schaub, July 21. 1719. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxvii.

† Walpole says upon this, in a letter to Stanhope of Sept. 28. 1716, O. S.;—"I understand by Bothmar that the King is pretty much determined to have the whole produce at his own will and private direction; and what is suggested to bring this matter immediately into a transaction is the danger there may be that the Parliament may by some act or vote lay their hands upon it and prevent the King's intentions."—I find from the Commons' Journals that full returns on the value of these lands were moved for and ordered. April 12. 1717.

To say nothing of the honours of Marlborough by female descent, we find Robert, the father of this Lord Sunderland, Prime Minister under James the Second; we find his great grandson First Lord of the Admiralty under George the Third; and his next descendant leader of the House of Commons under William the Fourth. The character of Earl Robert—false to his religion, to his friends, and to his country—is undefended, and I think indefensible. But the character of Earl Charles has, in my opinion, been unjustly depreciated; he has been confounded with his predecessor, and the perfidy of the parent has cast its blighting shade over the fame of the son.\* The father was a subtle, pliant, and unscrupulous candidate for Royal favour. The son carried his love of popular rights to the very verge of republican doctrines. If he be sometimes open to charges of secret cabals, we find him much more frequently accused of imprudent vehemence and bluntness. According to Lord Dartmouth, “Queen Anne said Lord Sunderland always “treated her with great rudeness and neglect, and chose “to reflect in a very injurious manner upon all Princes “before her, as a proper entertainment for her.”† Even his own father-in-law, the Duke of Marlborough, thinking him too hasty and incautious, had, in 1706, dissuaded his appointment as Secretary of State, and only yielded at length to the entreaties of his friends, and to the positive commands of the Duchess.‡ The post of Secretary of State was filled by him till June, 1710, with much talent and success; and on being dismissed from office, he refused the Queen’s proposal of a pension of 3000*l.* a year for life, declaring that if he could not have the honour of serving his country he would not plunder it—a degree of generosity which, in those times, was very

\* “Lord Sunderland is said to have too much resembled, as a “politician, the Earl his father.” (Lord Orford’s Works, vol. iv. p. 287.) This vague imputation is followed by a strange story about his consulting his rival Sir Robert Walpole, as to the restoration of the Stuarts; a story which I concur with Mr. Hallam (Const. Hist. vol. iii. p. 336.) in rejecting as utterly incredible.

† Note on Burnet’s History, vol. vi. p. 9.

‡ See Coxe’s Life, vol. iii. p. 88., &c. Marlborough at length said to his wife, “I have writ as my friends would have me, for I had “much rather be governed than govern.” August 9. 1706.

far from being common or expected. He was undoubtedly a man of great quickness, discernment, and skill; of a persevering ambition, of a ready eloquence. Under the snow of a cold and reserved exterior there glowed the volcano of an ardent and fiery spirit, a warm attachment to his friends, and an unsparing rancour against his opponents. His learning is not denied even by the enmity of Swift\*, and his activity in business seems to be equally unquestionable. In private life he might be accused of extravagance and love of play†, and his conduct in more than one public transaction appears to me either equivocal or blamable; but I may observe that several points for which he was condemned by his contemporaries, would, on the contrary, deserve the approbation of more enlightened times. Thus, for example, I find in a letter from the Duke of Grafton when Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland:—"Lord Sunderland carried the  
"compliment to this country too far, by choosing out of  
"the natives all the chief and most of the other Judges,  
"and the Bishops too, which has been attended with very  
"mischievous consequences to the English interest."‡

At the accession of George the First, Sunderland, conscious of his talents and his services, proud of the high places he had already filled, and relying on the eminent claims of his father-in-law, had expected to be the head of the new administration. It even appears that he intimated to Baron Bothmar his wish of being appointed Secretary of State, and that Bothmar, at one moment, was inclined to recommend him for that office.§ It was with bitter disappointment that he found his name, and that of Marlborough, omitted in the list of the Lords Justices during the King's absence. It was with still more chagrin that he afterwards saw himself placed beneath Lord Townshend, who had hitherto, in all public transactions, been subordinate to him. The Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, which was bestowed upon him, by no means satisfied his craving for power; he

\* See Swift's Works, vol. x. p. 304.

† Coxe's Marlborough, vol. vi. p. 342.

‡ This letter is dated Dec. 29. 1723, and is printed in Coxe's Walpole.

§ Macpherson's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 641.

accepted it with sullenness; he never went over for the discharge of its duties; and, on the death of the Marquis of Wharton, was permitted to exchange it for the post of Privy Seal and a seat in the Cabinet. Still, however, excluded from real authority, and still, therefore, discontented and restless, he, in a great measure, seceded from his colleagues, and took no part for their defence or assistance in the House of Lords. During the two first years of George's reign, his name scarcely ever occurs in the proceedings of that assembly. Meanwhile he attached to himself several of the seceders that now began, from various causes, to fall off from the great Whig party, more especially Lord Cadogan, Hampden, and Lechmere, and was prepared to use every opportunity for the overthrow of a Cabinet to which he still continued to belong.

In the month of July, Sunderland had been allowed by the King to go to Aix-la-Chapelle, to drink the waters. Walpole writes upon this to Stanhope:—"Lord Sunderland talks of leaving England in a fortnight, and, to be sure, will not be long from you. He seems very pressing to have instructions from us how to behave at Hanover. His professions for an entire reconciliation and a perfect union are as strong as words can express, and you may be sure are reciprocal; and when I consider that common interest should procure sincerity among us, I am astonished to think there is reason to fear the contrary."\* Accordingly, from Aix-la-Chapelle, Sunderland wrote for leave to proceed to Hanover; and this permission Stanhope used his influence to obtain from the King. An implied censure is cast upon Stanhope by a modern writer, as if he had acted treacherously towards Townshend and Walpole, in promoting instead of opposing, the application of their dissatisfied colleague.† But surely, on the contrary, it is evident, from the passage already cited in Walpole's letter, that such an application had been foreseen and reckoned upon in London—that Sunderland, far from making his journey to Hanover a secret, had asked Walpole for advice as to his conduct

\* Walpole to Stanhope, July 30. 1716, O. S. In another letter of Aug. 30. O. S., he says still more positively, "Lord Sunderland has left us, and *will be soon with you.*"

† See Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 96.

there—and that Walpole never requested Stanhope to hinder his progress. It is no less clear, from the mere fact of retaining this well-known antagonist in the Cabinet and in the office of Privy Seal, how necessary it was thought to keep on good terms with him. And, still further, Stanhope's recommendation rests on no external testimony, but on his own: he was so far from wishing to conceal it, as he might easily have done, had he pleased, that he mentioned it the same day to Lord Townshend's secretary with all the confidence of upright intentions. "I prevailed, this morning, for leave that Lord Sunderland should come hither after drinking the waters of Aix. He had writ to me for leave; and you will easily imagine, if it had not been granted, where the fault would have been laid; so I did really press it, and obtained it with difficulty."\*

When once at Hanover, Sunderland assiduously applied himself to gain the favour of the King and the friendship of Stanhope, and not without success. The misunderstanding which arose with Townshend gave him an excellent opportunity to fill up, as it were, the gap left vacant in the confidence of both the Monarch and the Minister. He attended the Court to Gohre, and was there when, on the 11th of November, Stanhope tendered his resignation. So far from accepting it, the King caused Stanhope to write, under his own eye, and in French, a letter to Townshend, expressing grave displeasure at the delays of the French treaty, and requiring an immediate explanation. Orders were, likewise, sent to prorogue the Parliament, and to postpone the public business, until His Majesty's return. On that day Sunderland also wrote to Townshend to the same effect, but without authority from the King, and in a very rough and peremptory tone, thus showing, at once, how imperious was his temper, and how great was the influence he had already acquired over the mind of his sovereign.†

The explanations of the Prime Minister were not long

\* Letter to Poyntz, September 8. 1716. Coxe's Walpole.

† See Stanhope's and Sunderland's letters in Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 126—128. I have already made some extracts from the former in explaining the grounds for the suspicions of Lord Townshend. The King himself also wrote to Lord Townshend on the same day, but his letter is not preserved.



delayed. They bear the same date as Stanhope's charges—the latter New Style, and the former Old. To Sunderland he vouchsafed no answer at all. To Stanhope, his answer is short and resentful—only a few lines, ending with, “I pray God forgive you: I do.” But his letter to the King contains a most manly, clear, and conclusive vindication of his conduct in every part of the transaction of which he stood accused.\*

But in the interval, whilst Lord Townshend's answers were still expected at Hanover, there came from him an important despatch on another subject. It appears that the King had, some time before, sent directions to the Cabinet Council in England to consult on the heads of the business which it would be necessary to bring forward in the next Session; His Majesty declaring, at the same time, that he was desirous of passing the whole winter abroad, if any means could be found to carry on his affairs in his absence. This seems to have been His Majesty's real inclination, although a more recent writer, without assigning a single proof from contemporary records, and speaking, so far as I can discover, merely from his own conjecture, represents it as a trap suggested by Sunderland to obtain proofs of the cabals with the Prince of Wales, which he imputed to Townshend and Walpole.† According to the King's orders Townshend, on November 2. Old Style, drew up, in a despatch to Stanhope, the sentiments of the Cabinet on the politics of the North, the payment of the public debts, the trial of Lord Oxford, and a proposed Act of Indemnity. Being anxious to gratify the King's inclination, Townshend did not press His Majesty's return on this occasion; but he strongly urged that, if His Majesty did remain at Hanover, the Prince should be entrusted with a discretionary power, so as to meet unexpected difficulties or altered circumstances.‡ Townshend, moreover, thought it right to

\* These letters, like the rest, are printed in Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 128—134.

† Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 99.

‡ See this despatch in Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 120. It may be observed that as to northern politics, Townshend greatly fluctuated in his opinion. In his former letter to Stanhope of Sept. 23 O. S., he urges a peace with Sweden, even at some sacrifice: in his letter



select some confidential person to be the bearer of this despatch, and to explain more fully to His Majesty, if needful, any of the points contained in it. For this purpose he pitched upon Horace Walpole. That gentleman had received from Hanover the permission he had solicited to quit the Hague, and leave the signature of the French treaty to his colleague\*, and thereupon he had returned to England.

Horace Walpole made such speed in his new commission as to reach Gohre on the 23d of November, New Style. He found that the King had by this time determined to return to England, and to open the Parliament in person; and he therefore appears to have considered the despatch of which he was the bearer, and which provided for the event of the King's absence, as supererogatory, and bestowed no further thought or care upon it. It will presently be seen how greatly he was mistaken, and how very unfavourable an impression that despatch was producing on the mind of His Majesty. The attention of Horace Walpole was, meanwhile, fully engrossed with the Royal and Ministerial resentments on the subject of the French treaty. He perused copies of the letters which had gone out to Lord Townshend, and observed, with sorrow and surprise, the unfounded suspicions of Stanhope and the rising ascendancy of Sunderland.

Want of frankness was never the fault of Horace Walpole. He warmly remonstrated with Stanhope; explained the doubtful circumstances in Townshend's conduct; declared, that if there was any blame incurred by the delay of the signatures at the Hague, that blame belonged solely to himself, and to his scruples in affixing his name to a separate treaty; and finally, he answered

of November 2. O. S., he is for pushing the war with Sweden, but coming to a good understanding with the Czar. Nor can this fluctuation be sufficiently explained by any intermediate discovery of the Swedish scheme for a Jacobite invasion, since that scheme would of course have dropped, had a peace been concluded as Townshend at first proposed.

\* Stanhope not only granted this permission to the urgent request of Horace Walpole, but so far complied with his views as to write to Dubois, proposing that the signature should be delayed eight days more, in hopes that the Dutch might finish their formalities within that time. See his letter in the *Mém. Secrets de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 227.

for the high honour and undiminished friendship of his two brother Ministers.

Stanhope, on his part, convinced by the truth of these remonstrances, acknowledged that he had been misled by unfounded suspicions and suggestions, and had wrongly accused Lord Townshend on the matter of the French treaty. "We must now, however," added he, "look forward instead of backward." He declared that he frankly cast off his own doubts, and promised to use his influence with the King to efface the unfavourable impression which His Majesty, like himself, had conceived, from the delay of the signatures.\* Accordingly, he vindicated Townshend's conduct to the King and to Sunderland, and had already, in a great measure, re-established His Majesty's former good humour and complacency before the arrival of Townshend's own letter of defence. That letter completed the good work; the King, like Stanhope, now candidly acknowledged his mistake, and desired Horace Walpole to convey to Townshend the strongest assurances of his entire satisfaction and confidence in the matter of the signatures. Nor did His Majesty give any hint to Horace Walpole of other causes for displeasure. Stanhope, on his part, warmly expressed to Horace Walpole his feelings of friendship and esteem for the brother Ministers; entrusted him with conciliatory letters to both, and earnestly requested him to lend his good offices for effacing all unpleasant recollections, and establishing a cordial and complete harmony between them. At the same time, however, he frankly warned Horace Walpole that rumours were abroad of cabals against the King's authority, begun by Townshend and Walpole with some of the Prince's adherents, and more especially with the Duke of Argyle; nor did Stanhope deny his own

\* The authentic details of what passed between Horace Walpole and Stanhope, are, except one or two scattered hints, only to be gleaned from two letters of the former to the latter, on December 8. and 23. 1716, N. S. Coxe, who has printed these letters, has added some particulars from his own ideas of probability. Where could he find any authority for saying that "Walpole reminded Stanhope that "he owed his high situation to Townshend and his brother," or that "Stanhope expressed a high sense of his obligations to them?" There is not a word to that effect in any contemporary statement, and the favour thus implied never existed, as I have shown elsewhere.

suspensions that there was some truth in this intelligence.\* Nevertheless, Horace Walpole, knowing these rumours to have no foundation in fact, and being naturally of a sanguine, confident temper, did not doubt but that his speedy return to England with the letters of Stanhope, and the declarations of the King, would thoroughly heal the late and hinder future dissensions. Accordingly, on the 3d of December, after a stay of only ten days, he again set out for England; but his journey was so much delayed by unforeseen accidents, his missing the yacht over the Maesland Sluys, and afterwards the contrary winds, that he did not arrive in London till the 22d. He then delivered his letters and messages, to the perfect satisfaction, as it seemed, of Townshend and Walpole. But a new storm was already in the air, and scarcely had the first been lulled before it burst.

In order to explain the causes of this second and decisive Ministerial tempest, it becomes necessary to revert to the King's jealousy and dislike of his son. We have already seen with what extreme reluctance His Majesty, on leaving England, had conferred upon His Royal Highness even the most moderate degree of authority. Every step, every word, from the Prince, were now most suspiciously watched, and most severely scrutinised at Hanover. Causes of displeasure soon arose, partly, it is true, from the Prince's fault, but much more from his necessary circumstances and position. The heir-apparent of a Crown seldom fails to be hated by the monarch in proportion as he is loved by the nation; and his only sure road to Court favour lies through unpopularity. Now the Prince, being less cold and reserved in demeanour than his father, and also in some degree acquainted with the

\* Horace Walpole writes to Stanhope, Dec. 23. 1716: "And as 'to the King's interest . . . what has been imputed to Lord Townshend and the others as a heinous crime, will be found to 'have been the most glorious and faithfullest part of their administration, for the service of His Majesty. I take this liberty with you 'because you talked in a very free though in a very mistaken manner to 'me on this subject.'" (Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 147.) The important fact of this frank intimation of the suspicions then at work and soon to cause Townshend's downfall, is quite overlooked or suppressed in Coxe's narrative. It would not have been compatible with his charge of treachery against Stanhope.

English language, was naturally better liked by the multitude: he increased his popularity by a short progress through Kent, Sussex, and Hampshire, and by several acts of grace, such as the dispensing with passports between Dover and Calais\*, which were all ascribed to him. Party-spirit, moreover, with its usual unerring instinct, darted upon this vulnerable point for assailing His Majesty's person and government. The Prince's affability of manner, his disposition to unite all parties, his fondness for English customs, were loudly extolled, with the covert insinuation of the King's deficiency in these qualities; and addresses to His Royal Highness were prepared and presented from several counties with the most loyal expressions, but often with the most dangerous designs. This, says Lord Townshend, is the wisest step the Jacobites have yet taken†; but it was, also, eagerly promoted by Lechmere, Hampden, and the other discontented Whigs.

Thus, even if faultless, the Prince would hardly have escaped suspicions and misgivings from Hanover. But his own conduct was besides indiscreet and caballing. He closely connected himself with the Duke of Argyle, paid court to the Tories and to the Whigs in opposition, and showed the utmost eagerness to hold the Parliament in person. "By some things that daily drop from him," says Walpole, "he seems to be preparing to keep up an "interest of his in Parliament, independent of the King's. " . . . . We are here chained to the oar, and working "like slaves, and are looked upon as no other."‡ Under such circumstances, and treated, as they were, with coldness by the Prince, the situation of Townshend and Walpole must, no doubt, have been sufficiently irksome. Nor was theirs an easy course to steer. It was incumbent upon them, for the King's service, to counteract the Duke of Argyle's ascendancy, and to gain the Prince's confidence and favour, and in this they partly succeeded. But, while striving for that object, they fell into the

\* Tindal's History, vol. vii. p. 33.

† Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 76.

‡ Letters to Stanhope, July 30. and Aug. 9. 1716, O. S. Coxe's Walpole.

opposite danger, by arousing against them jealousy and distrust in the mind of the King.

The integrity and honour of Lord Townshend in this, as in every other transaction of his life, were, I believe, without a stain. His prudence, however, in one or two cases, seems to be far more questionable, and he committed errors which his more cautious colleague successfully avoided. He was persuaded by the Prince to write to Stanhope, pressing the King for a speedy decision as to His Majesty's coming over, and plainly disclosing His Royal Highness's desire to hold the Parliament.\* Still more impolitic was the recommendation already mentioned in his despatch of the 2d of November, that a discretionary power should be vested in the Prince. That despatch was, in fact, as a modern writer well observes, the death-warrant of Lord Townshend's administration.† It seemed to add weight and confirmation to the charges of Sunderland of cabals with the Duke of Argyle and other discontented Whigs, and of an intention to set the son above the father. The King, however, suppressed his resentment at the moment, partly, I presume, on account of the arrival of Horace Walpole, and the justification of Lord Townshend precisely at that time from another imputation, and partly to obtain time to consult Bothmar and his other secret counsellors in England. The return of the post, about the middle of December, appears to have kindled His Majesty's latent indignation into open flame; and he vehemently declared his intention of dismissing Lord Townshend from his service.

Under these circumstances, Stanhope asserts that he first endeavoured to alter the King's resolution, and that, finding His Majesty immovable, he next applied himself to soften His Majesty's resentment, by representing the past services and high character of Lord Townshend, and the injustice of any open disgrace. These remonstrances wrought upon the King so far as to induce him to permit that Lord Townshend should be offered the appointment to another great and important dignity of state, the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland; so that the loss of his office of Secretary might seem an exchange, or

\* Townshend to Stanhope, Sept. 25. 1716. O. S. Coxe's Walpole.

† Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 102.



nominally even a promotion, instead of a dismissal. Accordingly, Stanhope wrote to Secretary Methuen, and likewise to Townshend, on the 15th of December, conveying that message from His Majesty in the most gracious terms, and without a single word expressive of the Royal indignation. To Robert Walpole he also wrote on the same day more at length: — “If I could  
“possibly have an hour’s discourse with you, I am sure  
“I should make you sensible that the part I have had in  
“the last step hath been for my Lord Townshend’s service. Every circumstance considered, I do in my conscience believe this was the only measure which could  
“secure the continuance of a Whig administration with  
“any ease to the King. His Majesty has been more  
“uneasy of late than I care to say; and I must own I  
“think he has reason, even though I don’t pretend to  
“know so much of the matter as the King does, His  
“Majesty receiving many advices which come neither  
“through my hands nor my Lord Sunderland’s. But I  
“cannot help observing to you, that he is jealous of certain intimacies with the two brothers (Argyle and  
“Isle). I hope His Majesty’s presence in England, and  
“the behaviour of our friends in the Cabinet, will remove these jealousies. No one can contribute more  
“to this than yourself; and I must tell you that my Lord  
“Sunderland, as well as myself, have assured the King  
“that you will do so. You know that ill offices had  
“been done you here, which might have made some impression, if my Lord Sunderland and I had not in good  
“earnest endeavoured to prevent it.\* — You will, I am  
“persuaded, believe that our endeavours were sincere,  
“when I shall have told you with the frankness I am  
“going to do what our scheme is here for the Ministry.  
“In case my Lord Townshend accepts of Ireland, which,  
“for a thousand reasons, he ought to do, the Cabinet

\* This assertion is confirmed by previous passages in Stanhope’s correspondence. Thus, writing to Lord Townshend on the 16th of October, he begs of him to press Walpole to settle the Munster and Saxe-Gotha payments, and adds the following friendly caution, — “I have more reason to press this than I care to say to you, but I fear some people do ill offices to Walpole.” See also his letter of the 6th of November to the same effect.



“ Council will remain just as it was, with the addition of  
“ the Duke of Kingston, as Privy Seal. Mr. Methuen  
“ and I shall continue Secretaries. But if my Lord  
“ Townshend shall decline Ireland, and if — which by  
“ some has been suggested, but which I cannot think  
“ possible — he should prevail upon you to offer to quit  
“ your employments, the King, in this case, hath engaged  
“ my Lord Sunderland and myself to promise that his  
“ Lordship will be Secretary, and that I, unable and un-  
“ equal as I am every way, should be Chancellor of the  
“ Exchequer for this Session; the King declaring, that  
“ as long as he can find Whigs that will serve him he  
“ will be served by them, which good disposition His  
“ Majesty shall not have reason to alter by any back-  
“ wardness in me to expose myself to any trouble or  
“ hazard. You know as much of our plan now as I do,  
“ and are, I dare say, fully satisfied that I think it highly  
“ concerns me that you should stay where you are. I  
“ am very sorry that my Lord Townshend’s temper hath  
“ made it impracticable for him to continue Secretary.  
“ The King will not bear him in that office, be the con-  
“ sequence what it will. This being the case, I hope  
“ and desire that you will endeavour to reconcile him to  
“ Ireland, which I once thought he did not dislike, and  
“ which, I think, he cannot now refuse, without declaring  
“ to the world that he will serve upon no other terms  
“ than being Viceroy over father, son, and these three  
“ kingdoms. Is the Whig interest to be staked in defence  
“ of such a pretension? or is the difference to the Whig  
“ party, whether Lord Townshend be Secretary or Lord  
“ Lieutenant of Ireland, TANTI?”

It is on this transaction that a charge of base dissimulation and treachery has been brought against Secretary Stanhope by Archdeacon Coxe. “As Brereton,” he says, “who conveyed these despatches without being apprised of their contents, could not have quitted Gohre more than three days subsequent to the departure of Horace Walpole, it was obvious that he (Horace Walpole) had been duped and deceived, that the plan for the removal of Sunderland had been then settled, and that the solemn promises made by Stanhope were never in-

"tended to be fulfilled."\* But it will be found from the authentic letters which Coxe himself has published that his heavy accusation rests upon a gross error he has made as to the dates. It does him no great honour as an historian that we should thus be able to disprove the statements in his first volume by the documents in his second. The letters from Stanhope, announcing the removal of Townshend, are dated on the 15th of December. On the 8th Horace Walpole had already reached the Hague on his way home from Hanover, and wrote to Stanhope an account of his progress.† It is evident, therefore, that he must have quitted Hanover towards the beginning of that month. But further still, a passage in a subsequent letter from Robert Walpole to Stanhope indicates the 2d of December as the precise day when Horace began his journey homewards. Alluding to the friendly expressions of Stanhope to Horace, and to the subsequent dismissal of Townshend, Robert Walpole observes, "What could possibly create so great an alteration among you in the space of twelve days is in vain to guess."‡ Thus, then, it appears that the real interval was no less than four times greater than that assigned by Archdeacon Coxe, and that therefore his charge of treachery deduced from the shortness of time completely falls to the ground.

Are there, however, any other grounds for accusing Stanhope of treachery in this transaction? I think none. How could he possibly have acted more kindly for his friend, or more patriotically for his country? When he found the King determined to dismiss his Prime Minister, and absolutely fixed in that determination, he could surely do no better for Lord Townshend than endeavour, as it were, to break the force of his inevitable fall, and obtain for him an appointment of still higher profit,

\* *Memoirs of Walpole*, vol. i. p. 101.

† See this letter in Coxe's *Walpole*, vol. ii. p. 137. It is to be remembered that all the letters of Horace Walpole from the Continent are, like Stanhope's, dated N. S. This is beyond question, he having left London express with Lord Townshend's despatch of Nov. 2., O. S., that is, Nov. 13. N. S., and his letters from the Hague and Hanover on his first arrival being dated Nov. 17. and 23.; and this is so stated by Coxe himself, vol. i. p. 99.

‡ *Coxe's Walpole*, vol. ii. p. 145.

and scarcely inferior power. It may be said, however, that he ought rather to have resigned his own office than acquiesced in the loss of Lord Townshend's. But what would have been the consequence? Not, I am convinced, any change in the King's inflexible temper, but the dissolution of the whole Whig administration; thus either throwing the Government into the hands of a factious opposition, or leaving the country, at a most stormy crisis, without any efficient hands at the helm. Can this really be thought the duty of an honest public servant? Let me borrow Stanhope's own words in writing to Methuen:—"The King thinks fit to remove one servant from a worse to a better post. Is this a reason for others to abandon him? I am sure that if it had happened to yourself to be turned out, and without any colour of reason, you would not in your own case let your resentment carry you to any indecent behaviour, much less would you spirit up mankind to such divisions as must end in the destruction of your country if not prevented. Do some people expect by their behaviour to force the King to make my Lord Townshend Secretary again? If they do, they don't know him. If they do not, what do they propose? . . . . Who ever wishes well to his King, to his country, and to my Lord Townshend, ought to persuade him to accept of Ireland. I hope Walpole, upon cooler thoughts, will use his endeavours to this end. If you have any interest or credit with them, for God's sake make use of it upon this occasion. They may possibly unking their master, or (which I do before God think very possible) make him abdicate England, but they will certainly not force him to make my Lord Townshend Secretary. I will not enter into the reasons which have engaged the King to take this measure, but it is taken; and I will ask any Whig whether the difference to the public between one man's being Secretary or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is of such consequence that we ought to hazard every thing for the resentment of one man?"\*

The vindication of Stanhope appears to me complete; and with respect to Sunderland also, I see no foundation

\* Stanhope to Methuen, January 13. 1717. Coxe's Walpole.

for any charge of treachery. I admit that, unlike Stanhope, he, far from striving to avert, probably promoted and co-operated in the fall of Townshend. But then his political position was very different from Stanhope's. He was not bound to Townshend by any ties of confidence and friendship. He had some grounds to complain of Townshend's jealousy, and of his own exclusion from power. He was considered by Townshend not as an ally, but as a rival; and his enmity was all along expected and foreseen. Now it surely must be owned that previous confidence is implied in a charge of treachery; and that where there was no friendship there can be no breach of friendship.

In concluding my narrative of the various and intricate transactions which led to Lord Townshend's dismissal, I may observe that even had they not existed there seems great reason to doubt whether the Ministry could have continued unchanged. We have some remarkable expressions to that effect in a letter written at a previous period under Townshend's own direction:—" His Lordship and Mr. Methuen are sorry to observe that from the disposition of offices, and the behaviour of Lords Sunderland and Cadogan before the King's going over, as well as from the encouragement since given to the Tories by the Prince's countenancing Mr. Hill, Mr. Hutchinson, and the Dukes of Shrewsbury and Argyle, the Whigs in general are become so uneasy and divided, that should things continue upon the present foot, the prospect for the next Session of Parliament would be but melancholy."\*

\* Mr. Poyntz to Secretary Stanhope, August 17. 1716, O. S. Coxe's Walpole.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE news of Lord Townshend's removal was received in London with almost universal disapprobation. No clear and definite cause being then assigned for that measure, and its advisers being absent from England, a large field was left open to conjecture, exaggeration, and mistrust.\* It was commonly considered as a Hanoverian cabal, as a fatal proof of the ascendancy of Continental politics; and the conduct of Stanhope, in being a party to it, was loudly and generally inveighed against. The Jacobites hailed this symptom of weakness in the Government as an omen of hope to their cause. The Whigs, who well knew the high worth and tried merit of Lord Townshend, felt no less sorrow than surprise at his dismissal; and the monied men foreboded the loss of public confidence, and the decline of public credit. "I will venture to say," writes Mr. Brereton, the same who brought these despatches from Hanover, "the town is in greater confusion now than it was in any part or at any alterations whatsoever made in the late Queen's reign. . . . When I go into the City all the considerable men there crowd about me, and press me in the most earnest manner to give some reasons for these sudden and unexpected resolutions, and to tell them who I thought were the advisers and contrivers of them."† It may be doubted, however, whether there is not some exaggeration in these statements, since, when we come to positive facts, we

\* "It is difficult to trace the causes of a dispute between statesmen." This was the remark of Sir Robert Walpole after his own quarrel with Lord Townshend in 1730. Coxe's *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 339.

† Mr. Brereton to Mr. Charles Stanhope, December, 1716. Erasmus Lewis writes to Swift, Jan 12. 1717.—"The division of the Whigs is so great that, morally speaking, nothing but another rebellion can ever unite them." In this sense Lewis would probably not have been displeased at their union.

find that the fall in the funds did not amount to one per cent.\*

Townshend himself, and the Walpoles, were not among the least indignant. Their resentment was still further exasperated by a very intemperate letter from Sunderland to Lord Orford, directly accusing Townshend, Robert Walpole, and the Lord Chancellor, of having entered into engagements with the Prince and Duke of Argyle against the King's authority.† No wonder that Townshend, perfectly innocent as he felt himself on that charge, should have more than ever given the reins to his passionate temper, should complain of this "infamous accusation" from the "villany and infatuation" of Lord Sunderland, and should impute to that nobleman "frenzy fits" in writing his letters.‡

Townshend lost no time in sending his answers to Hanover. To Stanhope he wrote only a few lines in a style of bitter irony; to the King his letter was couched in very loyal and becoming terms, respectfully but firmly declining the offer of Ireland. "My private affairs," says he in his correspondence with the Hague, "would not permit me to remove to Ireland, any more than common honesty would allow me to put the profits of that employment in my pocket, without going over to do the duties of it."§ This was intended as a severe reflection on Sunderland, for having acted in the manner here described; but it might have been more prudently omitted, since we shall find Townshend himself very shortly afterwards taking precisely that course which he had branded as repugnant to "common honesty."

Both the Walpoles, on their part, wrote to Stanhope in very reproachful terms, declaring that he had acted "in a passion," and with "sudden changes to old sworn friends;" and that, in their opinion, the authors of this

\* Letter from Mr. Charles Stanhope to Mr. Brereton. December, 1716.

† This letter itself is missing; but it is mentioned by Lord Townshend when writing to M. Slingeland, Jan. 1. 1717, O. S., and by Baron de Wassenaar when writing to Lord Townshend, Jan. 26. 1717. Coxe's Walpole.

‡ See Townshend's letter to Slingeland, Jan. 1. 1717, O. S.

§ Ibid.



"scheme did not expect that Townshend would, nor "desire that he should, accept the Lord Lieutenancy." Stanhope, in his reply, expresses deep concern that what he judged and meant as a service to Lord Townshend should be thus resented; that, so far from representing his Lordship's refusal of the Lord Lieutenancy to his prejudice, he had obtained the King's commands to renew the offer; that the Lord Lieutenancy would at all events be kept open for him till the King's return; and that he entreated Robert Walpole to prevail upon Townshend to accept it. He adds his satisfaction that Walpole at least has expressed no thoughts of resigning his office, and most earnestly hopes that they may "continue to live "and act for the King's service with the same friendship "and union which has been."\*

These friendly expressions tended in no small degree to allay the resentment of the brother Ministers; and a still more favourable effect was produced when the King left Hanover, and passed a few days at the Hague, on his way to England. The leading men of the Dutch republic were, for the most part, personal friends of Townshend. To one of them, Slingeland, he had just written a full account of his dismissal and vindication of his conduct. They openly expressed their fears of the fatal consequences which this division in the British Cabinet might produce to the combined interests of the two countries, and they left no exertion untried to promote a reconciliation. They held repeated conversations with Sunderland and Stanhope; they wrote pressing letters to Townshend. They assured him that Sunderland repented of his violent letter to Lord Orford, and of his charge of caballing with the Duke of Argyle, which had proceeded from his misconceiving a hasty expression of Lord Cadogan. They declared, as they truly might,

\* Stanhope to Robert Walpole, Jan. 1. and 3. 1717. Archdeacon Coxe imputes the conciliatory language of Stanhope in writing to Walpole and Methuen to his "terror" at perceiving the great weight which the opinion of the Dutch statesmen had with George the First when His Majesty was at the Hague on his return to England (*Memoirs of Walpole*, vol. i. p. 104, 105.). A single fact overturns this surmise. The letters quoted by Coxe are dated from Hanover before the King's departure.

that the blame rested mainly upon the Hanoverians, and their false intelligence from England ; that if Lord Townshend declined the King's commands at present, he would close the avenue to his returning favour ; and that if even Lord Townshend should be indifferent to that consideration, he ought still to sacrifice his own resentment to the necessity of union and to the public good.\*

The King himself, on his arrival (he landed at Margate towards the end of the month), received Townshend very graciously, and expressed his regret for the precipitation with which he had acted. By his direction the fallen Minister received a visit from Count Bernsdorf, who stated to him that His Majesty having, though perhaps on false reports and on hasty impulse, taken away the seals from Lord Townshend, could not, with due regard to his own consistency and character, immediately restore them. But, if Lord Townshend would accept of Ireland, the King, satisfied with that mark of submission, would give him every satisfaction in his power ; would make no other change whatever in the administration ; and, so far from requiring Townshend to proceed to his post, would allow him to continue a member of the Cabinet in England, and give him leave to consider the Lord Lieutenancy as only a temporary office, to be exchanged hereafter for another at his pleasure. Townshend was softened by these promises ; he saw, moreover, all the evils of division at that dangerous crisis ; and, being still more patriotic than passionate in his character, he gave way, and accepted the terms proposed to him. His political adherents, comprising Methuen, Pulteney, Walpoles, the Duke of Devonshire, and Lord Orford, were thus satisfied, and remained in their places. Methuen, who had hitherto merely acted as Secretary of State during Stanhope's absence, was now appointed his colleague for the southern department ; and thus it was hoped that the party schism might be completely closed, and the great body of Whigs completely reunited.

My wish of presenting these intricate Ministerial transactions in one unbroken narrative has prevented me

\* Baron de Wassenaar to Lord Townshend, Jan. 19. and 20. 1717. Coxe's Walpole.

from noticing till now the conclusion of the treaties at the Hague.—Even after sufficient full powers for Lord Cadogan had arrived, some trifling obstacles delayed for several days longer the separate signature of the Abbé Dubois. Cadogan insisted that the title of King of France should still be borne by George the First, and that the treaty should be written, not in French, but in Latin. In the former point he prevailed, in the latter he yielded; and, in fact, how could he deny that the two “Kings of France” should negotiate in the language of that country? “It is not difficult to discover,” says Dubois, “that these pretensions in the English Ministers proceed from their inexpressible terror of being brought before Parliament, and most severely arraigned on the “slightest pretext.”\* But these little difficulties being soon surmounted, the Convention between France and England was finally signed on the 28th of November.

Meanwhile, the slow formalities of the Dutch Republic were by no means exhausted, and the agents of the Court of Vienna made every exertion to delay or to prevent its accession. But happily the principal statesmen were sensible of their true interest; and some threats of the Regent’s displeasure having spurred their lazy good will, they at length waived some forms, quickened some others, and finally signed the treaty on the 4th of January, 1717. It repeated all the articles of the previous convention between England and France; which convention, when Stanhope, shortly afterwards, passed through the Hague, was, at his suggestion, destroyed; that no idea might prevail of separate interests, and that the whole might seem in appearance, as well as be in reality, “THE TRIPLE “ALLIANCE.”†

It had been intended that the King should open Parliament immediately on his return; but its meeting was delayed, and the public attention diverted by a new and unexpected discovery. That the Jacobites should enter into another conspiracy was no strange event; but to find the King of Sweden negotiating with them, and intending to assist their revolt by foreign invasion, might justly

\* *Mém. de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 232.; see also p. 454.

† *Mém. de Sevelinges*, vol. i. p. 240.; *Corps Diplomatique*, vol. viii. part i. p. 484. ed. 1731.

excite dismay. So far back as the late rebellion the Duke of Berwick had formed a project of this nature, and held several conferences upon it with Baron Spaar, the Swedish Minister at Paris. It was designed that a body of seven or eight thousand Swedes, then encamped near Gothenburg, should be embarked at that port; that a sum of 150,000 livres should be advanced by the Pretender for their expenses; and that they should proceed to Scotland, which, as Berwick observes, would be the easier, since no one had the least idea of such a scheme, and since, with favourable winds, the passage might be made in forty-eight hours.\* A trusty messenger was immediately despatched with this project to the King of Sweden. But Charles being then closely besieged in Stralsund, it was long before this communication could reach him; and when it did, the critical state of his own affairs compelled him to decline it. A renewal of this enterprise was now a favourite object with Charles, and recommended to him by the influence of Baron Gortz, his chief confidant and minister. Gortz was a Franconian by birth, and an adventurer in fortunes; but a man of singular activity, penetration, and address. For courage he was much less distinguished: he appears to have slunk ignominiously from several duels, especially from one with General Grumkow, first Minister to the King of Prussia †; and it is not a little singular that a coward should have gained the highest favour of the most warlike prince of his age. His wandering, hap-hazard mode of life, before his appearance at the Swedish Court, had given him a peculiar dexterity in dealing with different characters, and an utter freedom from scruple as to the means which he employed; and he was, says Voltaire, equally lavish of gifts and of promises, of oaths and of lies.‡

This active adventurer, having gone from Court to Court to stir up enemies against the House of Hanover, at length fixed his station at the Hague, as envoy from Sweden. Amongst those whom he had noticed and

\* *Mém. de Berwick*, vol. ii. p. 147. ed. 1778. See also the extracts from the Stuart Papers. Appendix.

† See Lamberty, *Mem.* vol. ix. p. 267. This was the same Grumkow so grossly caricatured in the *Mémoires de Bareith*.

‡ *Histoire de Charles XII.*, livre viii.

wished to take with him in his journeys, was Voltaire, at that time a very young man, known only as the author of some political lampoons, for which he was soon afterwards confined in the Bastille; but the historian has since commemorated the obscure intrigues of the satirist.\* From Holland Gortz carried on a secret correspondence, with Count Gyllenborg and Baron Spaar, the Swedish Ministers at London and at Paris; he had also some direct communications with the Pretender and the Duke of Ormond, and he had received full powers from Sweden. The views of Gortz were most extensive. He wished to form new political connections for his master, whose imprudent heroism had hitherto gained him more admirers than allies. He projected a peace with the Czar, and even a perfect concert of measures between that monarch and Sweden† — a conspiracy against the Regent in France — an insurrection against George the First in England — and an invasion of Scotland by Charles in person. It is evident that nothing could have been more auspicious for the Jacobite cause than to find itself freed from the unpopularity which attended its dependence upon France, and assisted no longer by a Romish but by a Protestant ally. Spain also entered warmly into this scheme. Its Prime Minister, Alberoni, sent to Spaar a subsidy of a million of French livres; and the little Court of the Pretender offered 60,000*l*. Time, which, next to money, is the chief auxiliary in such enterprises, was to be fixed as early as possible; the invading army was to number 12,000 Swedish soldiers, and the military reputation of their King was in itself a host.

Happily for England this mine was tracked before it burst. So far back as October, some letters between

\* See Voltaire, *Histoire de la Russie sous Pierre le Grand*, partie ii. ch. 8. Observe how slightly Voltaire, then called Arouet, is spoken of in the contemporary *Mémoires de St. Simon* (vol. xv. p. 69.).

† The Czar, who was then travelling in Holland and France, was certainly favourable, in general, to the schemes of Gortz. According to Voltaire, he did and he did not see Gortz at the Hague. “Gortz vit deux fois à la Haye cet Empereur.” (*Histoire de Charles XII.*) “Quand Gortz fut à la Haye le Czar ne le vit point.” (*Histoire de Pierre le Grand.*) But such inaccuracies are not uncommon in Voltaire.



Gyllenberg and Gortz being stopped and deciphered by the Government in London, afforded a clue to the whole conspiracy\*, and on the King's return fresh information was received, and further measures became necessary. Stanhope, to whose department this affair belonged, laid it before the Council on the 29th of January, and proposed the decisive remedy of arresting the Swedish envoy and seizing his papers. A foreign Minister who conspires against the very Government at which he is accredited has clearly violated the law of nations. He is, therefore, no longer entitled to protection from the law of nations. The privileges bestowed upon him by that law rest on the implied condition that he shall not outstep the bounds of his diplomatic duties, and, whenever he does so, it seems impossible to deny that the injured Government is justified in acting as its own preservation may require. On such grounds the Cabinet having agreed to the proposal of arresting Gyllenberg, it was executed on the same day by General Wade, who found the Count making up some despatches. In a few words he explained his mission, laid hold of the papers on the table, and demanded those from the scrutoire. The Swede, much surprised and irritated, warmly expostulated on the laws of nations being violated in his person, and asked leave to send for the Marquis de Monteleon, the Spanish Ambassador, that he might consult with him; but Wade stated his positive orders not to let him speak with any person. On the other hand, the Count would by no means give up the key of the scrutoire, and the Countess, who came in, declared that it contained only her plate and linen; but it being, nevertheless, broke open, it was found to be full of papers. These, General Wade, according to his instructions, sealed up and carried away, leaving a sufficient guard upon his prisoner. On the same day were also arrested, Mr. Cæsar, Member of Parliament for Hertford, and Sir Jacob Bancks, formerly

\* Lord Townshend to Secretary Stanhope, Oct. 12. and Nov. 2. 1716. (Coxe's Walpole.) Bolingbroke, writing to Wyndham, Sept. 13., observes, "The people who belong to St. Germain's and Avignon "were never more sanguine in appearance."



member for Minehead, who were suspected of a share in the same conspiracy.\*

In a proceeding so unusual and startling, it was judged proper that Stanhope should write a circular to all the foreign Ministers in London, informing them of the reasons for Gyllenborg's arrest; and none of them expressed any resentment, except the Marquis de Monteleon.† But a far more complete vindication than Stanhope's letter was afforded by those of Gyllenborg, which had been seized at his house, and which were forthwith published by authority.‡ They confirmed, in the most undoubted manner, all the charges of the Government, all the suspicions of the public. It is remarkable that the name of Walpole occurs in them; and some hasty words of his are repeated, as if his disgust with some of his brother Ministers might probably draw him into the conspiracy. In this I am persuaded that Gortz and Gyllenborg did complete injustice to Walpole, and, in fact, their expressions clearly prove that he had not afforded them any adequate grounds for such hopes.§

Gortz was on his way to England to put the last hand to the conspiracy, and had already reached Calais, when he heard of the fate of his colleague, and upon this returned to Holland. But at Arnheim he and his two secretaries were taken into custody, by an order from the States, obtained at the application of England. The arrest of this prime mover was certainly still more important than Gyllenborg's, but it appears to me to have been far less justifiable. For, admitting the full right of any government to seize and search a foreign Minister if

\* "Count Gyllenborg has passed most of this summer with Cæsar, "a creature of Lord Oxford's, in Hertfordshire." Townshend to Stanhope, Oct. 12. 1716.

† Political State, 1717, vol. i. p. 150.

‡ The material passages of this correspondence are printed in the Parliamentary History, vol. vii. p. 396—421.

§ "I do not know whether Mr. Walpole's expressions were the "effect of his first rage on account of his brother-in-law, my Lord "Townshend's, being removed, or whether they came from his heart." Gyllenborg to Gortz, January 23. 1717. The subject was mentioned in the House of Commons by Mr. Hungerford, on the 22nd of February. Coxe, in his Life of Walpole, passes over the whole transaction in silence.

conspiring against itself, yet it by no means follows that this extreme resource should be extended to the case of a conspiracy against an ally.

Charles, when informed of the proceedings at London and at Arnheim, maintained a haughty silence, neither owning nor disowning the conduct of Gyllenborg, but directing, as a measure of reprisal, the arrest of Mr. Jackson, the British Resident in Sweden. With respect to the Dutch, whom he wished to conciliate, he pursued a milder course, merely forbidding their Minister to appear at his Court. Meanwhile, the Regent of France interposed his good offices as mediator; and, after several months of negotiation, and the Regent making an assurance, in the name of Charles, that His Majesty had never any intention to disturb the tranquillity of Great Britain, Count Gyllenborg was sent home and exchanged with Mr. Jackson; and Gortz, with the consent of the English Government, was set at liberty in Holland.\*

The Parliament, on its meeting (it was opened on the 20th of February by the King in person), expressed great indignation at the conspiracy so happily crushed. One member even went so far as to move that war should be declared against Sweden; which, Stanhope observed, it would be quite time enough to do if Charles should acknowledge the practice of his Ministers. Addresses to the King were carried in both Houses with perfect unanimity. But this happy concord was not of long continuance; and the late schism in the administration was soon found to be by no means truly and thoroughly healed. Walpole was too conscious of his own ability and influence, and too aspiring in his temper, to be long contented with a second place. His own quarrel, some years afterwards, with his brother-in-law and most intimate and steady friend Lord Townshend, clearly shows how little he could bear a rival near the throne; and according to his own expression at that time, he was determined that the firm should be not Townshend and Walpole, but Walpole and Townshend. Thus also he ill brooked the superior influence of Sunderland and Stanhope. Private coldness, and, perhaps, private cabals, soon led to public reserve, to utter silence in the House

\* Political State, 1717, vol. ii. p. 83.

of Commons, or to faint and formal support. On the motion of granting His Majesty a supply against Sweden, it was expected by the Government that Walpole, named as he had been in the Swedish correspondence, would have felt it incumbent upon him to show peculiar zéâl and energy. But, on the contrary, his unwillingness and dissatisfaction were apparent; and though he did speak in favour of the motion\*, yet he seems to have done so coldly and shortly; and all his and Townshend's personal adherents, known to act according to his advice and direction, voted on the opposite side. They were, of course, joined in this policy by the whole body of Jacobites, Tories, and discontented Whigs, and prevailed so far that, on the division, the motion for a supply was carried by a majority of only four—the numbers being 153 against 149.

No Government could possibly close its eyes or restrain its hands from the authors of so insidious an attack; and coming as it did from the party of which Lord Townshend was called the leader, it was necessary to make an example of that nobleman. The state of the case was immediately laid before the King; and, according to His Majesty's directions, Secretary Stanhope, on the same evening of the division, the 9th of April, wrote a letter to Lord Townshend, acknowledging his past services, but announcing his dismissal from the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. If Stanhope and Sunderland had formed any similar intention against Walpole, it was anticipated by that Minister, who, early next morning, waited on His Majesty to resign his places of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. George showed great regret at parting with so able a servant, and endeavoured to persuade him to keep his post, using many kind expressions, and several times pressing the seals back upon him; but Walpole, though moved even to tears by His Majesty's goodness, remained firm in his determination. His example was followed the same morning by Methuen and Pulteney, and, a few days afterwards, by Lord Orford and the Duke of Devonshire.

\* Coxe is mistaken in saying that Walpole in this debate "maintained a profound silence." (Life, p. 106.) Both Robert and Horace Walpole spoke for the Supply. (Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 439.)

Stanhope was appointed First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sunderland and Addison Secretaries of State, James Craggs Secretary at War, the Earl of Berkeley First Lord of the Admiralty, the Duke of Newcastle Lord Chamberlain, and the Duke of Bolton Lord Lieutenant of Ireland: Lord Cowper and the Duke of Kingston remaining in their places.

The loss of Walpole was severely felt by the new administration. His influence with the House of Commons, and his reputation with the public, had greatly risen, and he was superior to Stanhope both in power of debate and in knowledge of finance. His late conduct, however, exposed him to many angry reflections; his cabal against his colleagues was termed "a criminal conspiracy," and his withdrawing from the Government, "a defection;" and these charges appear to have induced him, during the first few days, to pursue a very moderate course. When Stanhope proposed to fix the subsidy against Sweden at 250,000*l.*, and when Pulteney thundered against "a German Ministry," Walpole closed the debate, and turned it in favour of the Government by observing, that having already spoken in favour of the Supply, he should now give the Court his vote. Soon afterwards he took an opportunity to promise, in the House of Commons, that "the tenor of his conduct should show he never intended to make the King uneasy, nor to embarrass his affairs."\* But never, certainly, was any profession so utterly belied in performance. Almost from the moment he left the Treasury until the moment he returned to it, he uniformly and bitterly opposed every measure of the Government. No regard for the public, no feeling for his own consistency, ever withheld him. He unscrupulously leagued himself with Shippen, Wyndham, Bromley, and other decided enemies to the reigning dynasty, insomuch that Shippen, on one occasion, expressed his satisfaction that his friend Walpole was no more afraid than himself of being called a Jacobite. He had made a warm opposition to the Schism Bill at its passing, saying that it rather resembled a decree of Julian the Apostate, than a law of a Protestant Parliament;

\* Parliamentary History, vol. vii. p. 446. and 449.

yet he no less strenuously resisted the repeal of that very law when proposed by Stanhope. We shall find him, who had been one of the prime movers of Oxford's impeachment, contriving a legal difficulty, and assisting that Minister's escape. We shall find him joining the vulgar outcry against a standing army, and declaring that 12,000 men were fully sufficient, at the very time when he well knew the country to be in danger of another insurrection, and of invasions both from Sweden and from Spain. We shall find him, so acute and practical a statesman, not ashamed to argue against that necessary measure the Mutiny Bill, and exclaiming in the heat of debate, "He that is for blood shall have blood!" In short, his conduct out of office is indefensible, or, at least, is undefended even by his warmest partisans\*; and, in looking through our Parliamentary annals, I scarcely know where to find any parallel of coalitions so unnatural, and of opposition so factious.

The character of a statesman so reckless in opposition, but so eminent in office, deserves the most attentive consideration, and affords the best clue to the history of England for more than twenty years. During his life, he was loaded with unmerited censures; since his death, he has sometimes received exaggerated praise. Amidst the showers of invective which his enemies have poured, amidst the clouds of incense which his flatterers have raised, the true lineaments of his mind are dimly and doubtfully seen; and I should have failed far more completely in my attempt to give an impartial representation of them, but for the kindness of a most eminent man, who has condescended to point out several errors in my first impressions, and to send me his own matured reflections on this subject.

Robert Walpole was born in 1676, of an ancient gentleman's family in Norfolk. His natural indolence would probably have overpowered and kept down his natural abilities, had he not been a third son, and seen the necessity of labour for his bread. At Eton, where he was the contemporary, and in some degree the rival, of St. John, he was educated as one intended for the Church, and used to

\* See the reflections of Speaker Onslow and of Archdeacon Coxé (*Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 110., and vol. ii. p. 551.).



say of himself afterwards, with perhaps no unreasonable vanity, that had he taken orders, he should have been Archbishop of Canterbury instead of Prime Minister. But, at the age of twenty-two, he found himself, by the death of his brothers, heir to the family estate, with a double advantage—the inheritance of an elder and the application of a younger son. On the decease of his father in 1700 \*, he was returned to Parliament for the family borough of Castle Rising. He immediately and zealously attached himself to the Whigs; and as, besides the two seats at Castle Rising, he could command another at Lynn, he brought his party no small accession of political patronage. The first time when he rose to speak (on what subject is not recorded) he by no means fulfilled the hopes of his friends; he was confused and embarrassed, and, according to the Parliamentary phrase, “broke down.” But his perseverance soon retrieved this failure. The occasion on which he appears to have first distinguished himself was the celebrated proceeding on the Aylesbury election in 1704; and thus, by a curious contrast, the statesman, who was afterwards denounced as the most profligate parliamentary leader ever known in England, the very “father of corruption,” gained his earliest laurels as the champion of free elections!

From this time forward Walpole slowly but steadily rose in fame as a debater. He also naturally contracted a close friendship and intimacy with many of the leading men of his party, especially with Lord Treasurer Godolphin; with Pulteney, who in after life became his chief rival and antagonist; and with Stanhope, who had taken his brother Horace as his private secretary. In March,

\* Horace Walpole says in one of his letters, “The other day Sir Robert found an old account book of his father’s, wherein he set down all his expenses. In three months and ten days that he was in London one winter, he spent — what do you think? — 64*l.* 7*s.* 5*d.* “There are many articles for Nottingham ale, eighteen pence for dinners, five shillings to Bob (Sir Robert), and one memorandum of six shillings given in exchange to Mr. Wilkins for his wig. And yet this old man, my grandfather, had 2000*l.* a year Norfolk sterling. He little thought that what maintained him for a whole Session would scarce serve one of his younger grandsons to buy japan and fans for Princesses at Florence.” — (Letters to Sir Horace Mann, vol. i. p. 191. ed. 1833.)



1705, he was appointed one of the Council to the Lord High Admiral; and in 1708, when St. John resigned the Secretaryship of War, Walpole was promoted to that office. Next year he was also made Treasurer of the Navy. In 1710 he was one of the Managers of Sacheverell's impeachment; but when the disgrace of his friends followed close upon that ill-advised, or at least unfortunate, measure, he honourably adhered to their falling fortunes, and in spite of some insidious overtures from Harley, threw up his Secretaryship in September the same year. His party attachment, however, was soon to expose him to greater evils than the loss of place. In December, 1711, a charge of corruption was brought forward against him in the House of Commons, relating to some forage contracts, which, as Secretary at War, he had made in Scotland. Witnesses were examined, and Walpole heard in his defence. A warm debate ensued; and at length the House resolved, "That Robert Walpole Esq. was guilty of a breach of trust, and notorious corruption; that he should be committed prisoner to the Tower of London;" and on a subsequent motion, "That he should be expelled the House." It is quite certain, however, from the temper of his judges, that even the most evident innocence, or the strongest testimonies, would not have shielded him from condemnation, and that, had he made no forage contracts at all, or made them in the spirit of an Aristides or a Pitt, he would have been expelled with equal readiness by that House of Commons—the same which did not blush to hurl an unworthy charge of peculation against Marlborough.

On his condemnation, Walpole surrendered himself a prisoner, and was sent to the Tower. His sentence, so far from impairing his character, raised his reputation. He was considered a martyr to his party, and praised as martyrs real or fancied always are. He received repeated visits in prison from Marlborough, Somers, Godolphin, and the other chief men of the day; and when released at the end of the Session in July, 1712, he found himself raised to an important personage in the estimation of his friends. The Tories, however, still continued to look upon him as a very subordinate character; and so late as 1713, we find Swift, in some satirical verses,

place Walpole in the lowest rank of the Whigs as a contrast to Lord Somers.\*

An attempt had been made to re-elect Walpole for his borough; but the House of Commons declared him incapable of sitting in that Parliament, and he was therefore excluded till the Dissolution next year. In the interval he assisted Steele in the composition of several party pamphlets, continued and improved his political connections, and on re-entering Parliament (from which point he joins and is borne along with the current of my narrative), he spoke with an energy and effect which he never yet had attained. The Ministers found that, in attempting to crush, they had only sharpened his hostility.

The talents of Walpole were eminently practical, and fit for the conduct of great affairs. He was always steady, and therefore usually successful in his schemes. His views of policy were generally most acute, and his knowledge of finance profound. No fanciful theory, no love of abstract principles, ever warped his judgment; even the most trying circumstances could very seldom ruffle his good humour; and calm himself, he worked upon the passions of others. So closely had he studied all the weak points of human nature — so skilfully were his address and management adapted to them, that he scarcely ever failed, either in public or in private, to gain upon his hearers. There have certainly been many more eloquent orators, but never, I believe, a more dexterous debater. He would not willingly leave even the least part of his subject untouched. He knew that weak minds seldom yield to a single argument, even to the strongest, but are more easily overpowered by a number, of whatever kind. Always catching and always following the disposition of the House — knowing exactly when to press, and when to recede — able at pleasure to unfold

\*  
“You'll then defy the strongest Whig,  
“With both his hands, to bend a twig,  
“Though with united strength they all pull,  
“From Somers down to Craggs and Walpole.”

(Swift's Works, vol. x. p. 398.) Craggs was then only a sort of *Galopin D'Ambassade*.

the most intricate details, or to involve in specious reasoning the grossest fallacies—he, in the long run, prevailed over spirits far more lofty and soaring.

We are assured, however, that the powers of debate were not those to which he entirely or principally trusted for the management of the House of Commons. The indignant clamour of his contemporaries—the eloquent voice of a Wyndham—the magic pen of a Bolingbroke—have denounced in glowing terms the patron and parent of Parliamentary corruption. Beneath the flowers of their rhetoric, and the venom of their party rancour, there is no doubt a foundation of truth. But the more equal tribunal of posterity has discovered no small excuse for him in the political turpitude even of many who thus arraigned him—in the general lowness and baseness of his age—in the fact, that so many of the representatives of the people were on sale, and ready, if not bought by Walpole, to be bid for by the Jacobites. The more the private letters of this period come to light the more is this truth apparent. What shall we say, for example, when we find the great-grandson and representative of Hampden, and himself a distinguished statesman, have the effrontery to threaten in writing, that, unless he can obtain a pension from the reigning family, he will “very soon take service in some other family”—meaning the Pretender’s?\*. Are we really justified in speaking as if public men had been all disposed to be virtuous and incorruptible during Walpole’s government, and were turned from the paths of honour by the address of that wily tempter?

Besides, are not these charges against Walpole marked by extreme exaggeration, even on the testimony of his enemies themselves? At the fall of Walpole a select Committee was appointed to inquire into his public conduct during the last ten years, and out of its 21 members, that Committee comprised no less than 19 of his bitterest enemies. The Minister then stood forsaken and alone—there was no Court favour at his back—no patronage or lucre in his hands—much popularity to gain, and no danger to run by assailing him. Yet, even under such

\* Letter to Lady Suffolk, June 30. 1727, in the Suffolk Correspondence.

favourable circumstances, what did this ten years' siege upon his character, this political Troy, really bring forth at last? What facts does the report allege in support of its avowed hostility? An attempt upon the virtue of the Mayor of Weymouth! The promise of a place in the revenue to a returning officer! The atrocity of dismissing some excise officers who had voted against the Government candidate! Vague surmises from the large amount of secret service money! Now, if Walpole had in real truth been the corrupter of his age — if he had prostituted public honours or public rewards in the cause of corruption — if fraudulent contracts, undue influence at elections, and bribed members of Parliament, were matters of every-day occurrence — if, in short, only one tenth part of the outcry against Walpole was well founded, how is it possible that powerful and rancorous opponents should be able to find only so few, imperfect, and meagre proofs to hurl against him? No defence on the part of Walpole's friends is half so strong and convincing as this failure of his enemies.

On these grounds, then, I think that we are justified in asserting — first, that there was extreme exaggeration in the charges against Walpole, and, secondly, that there is no small excuse to be found for him in the tone and temper of his age. I am far, however, from denying that considerable corruption did exist. I am even inclined to believe that Walpole did not sufficiently strive against it, and went beyond the supposed necessities of the case. An honest Minister, even if unable to stem the tide of corruption — even if he can reconcile it to his conscience to be borne along by it — should at least never lose the hope of changing its direction, and purifying its waters. Still less should he do any thing to strengthen its current and aggravate its foulness. Now, it appears to me that the corruption of public men, so far from diminishing, rather grew and increased during the long administration of Walpole. On this point it is impossible to produce any English testimony that shall be considered quite free from partiality. But Count Palm, the Imperial Minister in London, could have no bias for or against the previous characters of our history, and we find him in 1726 apparently limiting the corrup-

tion of the House of Commons within "these few years."\* Some other testimonies might, I think, be shown. But it also seems to me that the sort of language which we are assured was held by Walpole in familiar conversation was calculated to prolong and to perpetuate a low tone of public morals. He used to talk of honesty and patriotism as "school-boy flights;" of himself as "no saint," "no Spartan," "no reformer;" and ask young men, when first entering public life with their inborn feelings and classic themes of freedom fresh upon them, "Well, are you to be an old Roman? — a patriot? You will soon come off that, and grow wiser." — Thank God! the next generation did not "come off that," and was "wiser!"

The administration of Walpole was prudently and beneficially directed to the maintenance of peace abroad, to the preservation of quiet and the progress of prosperity at home. It may, however, be doubted whether, in his domestic policy, he was not too fond of palliatives, and applied himself merely to silence complaints, instead of redressing wrongs. It is also to be observed, that though he loved peace much, he loved his own power more. He kept the country from hostilities so long as he could do so with safety to himself; but when the alternative lay between a foolish war and a new administration, he never hesitated in deciding for the former. Office was, indeed, his natural element; when excluded from it, he was, as we have seen, most turbulent and restless; he crept back to it, through a peculiarly humbling coalition; and even at the end, Speaker Onslow assures us that he "went very unwillingly out of his power."

The knowledge of Walpole was very limited, and he patronised literature as little as he understood it. "In general," says his son, "he loved neither reading nor writing."† "How I envy you!" he exclaimed to Fox,

\* See Coxe's Walpole, vol. ii. p. 506.

† Horace Walpole to Mann, Aug. 17. 1749. I do not, however, place any reliance on the well-known story, that during the Excise debates Walpole heard for the first time of Empson and Dudley. On referring to Walpole's own speech (Parl. Hist. vol. viii. p. 1305.), it will be seen that he begins by acknowledging the hints he had received from Yorke, and then draws an elaborate contrast between



whom he found one day, after his fall, reading in the library at Houghton. His splendid success in life, notwithstanding his want of learning, may tend to show what is too commonly forgotten in modern plans of education—that it is of far more importance to have the mind well disciplined than richly stored—strong rather than full. Walpole was, however, fond of perusing and quoting Horace, to whom, in his private character, he might, perhaps, not unaptly be compared. He was good-tempered, joyous, and sensual, with an elegant taste for the arts; a warm friend, an indulgent master, and a boon companion. We are told of him, that whenever he received a packet of letters, the one from his gamekeeper was usually the first which he opened. To women he was greatly addicted, and his daughter by his second wife was born before their marriage. He had an easy and flowing wit, but too commonly indulged it to the utmost limits of coarseness; and Savage who had seen him familiarly at Lord Tyrconnel's, used to say of him that the whole range of his mind was from obscenity to politics, and from politics to obscenity.\* In his private expenses, he was not only liberal, but lavish; and it must be acknowledged that the magnificence of his buildings, the extent of his purchases, and the profusion of his entertainments at Houghton, gave his enemies no small handle for invective.† He should have recollected that the display of wealth by a Prime Minister is always unpopular with the multitude: if acquired, it excites suspicion; if inherited, envy. So true is this, that in democracies an outward air of poverty is often considered the best recommendation to public favour and confidence. In the United States an intelligent French traveller lately

himself and the unworthy favourites alleged by Wyndham. Now surely it is a very different thing never to have heard of Empson and Dudley, and not to be conversant with every minute particular of their lives and characters. In these Yorke was no doubt better versed.

\* See Johnson's *Life of Savage*.

† According to Coxe, his buildings and purchases at Houghton must have cost no less than 200,000*l.* (p. 728.), his pictures 40,000*l.* (p. 730.), his lodge at Richmond 14,000*l.* (p. 759.), and each "meeting" at Houghton 3000*l.* (p. 758.). I believe that he died far from rich.



saw an eminent living statesman, a candidate for the Presidency, canvassing in a patched coat and ragged hat.\* Such is the uniform of the courtiers to King Mob!

It would be unjust to Walpole to conclude his character without alluding to his mildness and placability towards his political opponents. The system under which contending statesmen used to raise up rival scaffolds, and hunt down one another even to the death, ended during his administration; although I must own that I think no small part of the praise belongs to the personal clemency and kindness of George the First and George the Second.† On the whole Walpole appears to me to have been a man of many useful and some great qualities; who faithfully served his country, but who never forgot his own family; and who rose partly by the frailties of others, as well as by merits of his own. With every allowance for the “evil days and evil tongues” amongst which his lot had fallen, it is impossible not to own that his character wants something of moral elevation. Name him in the same sentence with a Chatham, and who will not feel the contrast? The mind of Chatham bears the lineaments of a higher nature; and the very sound of his name carries with it something lofty and august. Of Walpole, on the other hand, the defects—nay, perhaps, even the merits—have in them something low and common. No enthusiasm was ever

\* *Marie, ou l'Esclavage aux Etats Unis*, par M. de Beaumont, vol. i. p. 227. He says, that he saw the gentleman in question “par-courir le pays avec un vieux chapeau et un habit troué. Il fait sa cour au peuple. Chaque régime a ses travers et tout souverain ses caprices.” More lately, however, the American editor of my History, while acknowledging M. de Beaumont’s in general friendly tone, declares his statement in this instance to be only “a foreigner’s hasty assumption by which some carelessness of dress is converted into a purpose of gaining popularity.”

† On this point we may safely trust the testimony of a zealous Jacobite. Lockhart of Carnwath tells us, “It was moved and pressed in the Cabinet Council, to prosecute the Earls of Wigtoun, Kincardine, and Dundonald, the Lord Balmerino, and myself, for high treason (in 1726), but the late King (George the First) opposed it; he said ‘he would have no more blood or fore-faulters’ . . . and in this he was so positive, that his Ministers, after several attempts, were forced to drop it.” (vol. ii. p. 398.)

felt for his person ; none was ever kindled by his memory No man ever inquired where his remains are laid, or went to pay a homage of reverence at his tomb. Between him and Chatham there is the same difference as between success and glory !

At the period of Walpole's resignation, in 1717, he had just matured a very able and well considered scheme for the reduction of the national debts. The rate of common interest for money had, by the statute of the 12th of Anne, been reduced to five per cent. ; but in the funds it continued to exceed seven\* ; and of these funds a part, namely, the Long and Short Annuities, was irredeemable, and could not be touched without the consent of the proprietors. The plan of Walpole, in which we may trace the earliest germ of a National Sinking Fund, was, in the first place, to borrow 600,000*l.* at only four per cent., and to apply all savings to the discharge of the principal and interest of the debts contracted before December, 1716. Concurrently with this scheme, he hoped to form arrangements with the Bank and South Sea Companies, by which they should not only reduce their own interest, but lend, if required, the former two millions and a half, and the latter two millions, at five per cent., to pay off such holders of redeemable debts as might refuse to accept an equal reduction. The first part of these measures was brought forward by Walpole on the very day of his resignation ; an event which he announced, saying, " that he now presented that Bill as a country gentleman ; but hoped that it would not fare the worse for having two fathers, and that his successor would take care to bring it to perfection." Nor were the expectations of Walpole disappointed ; the arrangements he had in view with the Bank and South Sea

\* " Do not we make seven or eight per cent. by the public funds, "and this upon the security of the Parliament of England, and are "paid punctually every quarter ?" (Remarks of an English Gentleman to Count Gyllenborg, as quoted in his letter to Gortz, Dec. 4. 1716.) Mr. Hungerford said in the House of Commons, May 20. 1717, " He knew by experience, and in the course of his business, that "money may be had at 4 per cent. on good securities." See the detailed accounts in the Commons' Journals, vol. xviii. p. 497—507.

Companies were successfully concluded, with some alterations, by Stanhope; a result, no doubt, almost entirely owing to Walpole's skill and reputation for finance\*; but marked with peculiar disinterestedness on the part of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer. He stated, in the House, that he understood it had been the common practice of those concerned in the administration of the Treasury to make bargains for the public with the Governors and Directors of Companies, by which some private advantages were generally made; but that, in his opinion, such bargains ought to be determined at the Bar of the House; and if any advantages could be made, the public ought to have the benefit of them. This was a system in which his predecessors had not proposed any alteration.

The financial measures in question were finally embodied in three Bills, and all passed into laws. But though Stanhope and Walpole scarcely differed on this subject, a violent altercation arose between them on one occasion when it was before the House. Stanhope, giving way to his passionate temper, said that "he ingenuously owned his incapacity for the affairs of the Treasury, which were so remote from his studies and inclination that therefore he would fain have kept the employment he had before, which was both more easy and profitable to him; but that he thought it his duty to obey the King's commands;—that, however, he would endeavour to make up, by application, honesty, and disinterestedness, what he wanted in abilities and experience;—that he would content himself with the salary and lawful perquisites of his office; and, though he had quitted a better place, he would not quarter himself upon any body to make it up;—that he had no brothers, nor other relations, to provide for; and that, on his first entering into the Treasury, he had made a standing order against the late practice of granting reversions of places."

\* Several publications have assigned to Stanhope the merit of these reductions, and we read on his monument in Westminster Abbey, "*Delicatum publicarum pecuniarum fidem, temperato solerter fœnore, conservavit integram.*" I am bound to say, that I think this praise belongs not to Stanhope but to Walpole.

Walpole, stung by these insinuations, replied with great warmth, complaining, in the first place, of breach of friendship and betraying private conversation. He frankly owned that, while he was in employment, he had endeavoured to serve his friends and relations, than which, in his opinion, nothing was more reasonable or more just. "As to the granting reversions," he added, "I am willing to acquaint the House with the meaning of that charge. I have no objections to the German Ministers whom the King brought with him from Hanover, and who, as far as I have observed, have behaved themselves like men of honour; but there is a mean fellow" (alluding to Robethon), "of what nation I know not, who is eager to dispose of employments. This man, having obtained the grant of a reversion, which he designed for his son, I thought it too good for him, and therefore reserved it for my own son. On this disappointment the foreigner was so impertinent as to demand 2500*l.*, under pretence that he had been offered that sum for the reversion. But I was wiser than to comply with his demands, and one of the chief reasons that made me resign was, because I would not connive at some things that were carried on." Stanhope answered; Walpole rejoined; several violent expressions passed; and it needed the interference of the House to prevent a hostile meeting between these former friends. Soon after this time, Pope writes, "The political state is under great divisions; the parties of Walpole and Stanhope as violent as Whig and Tory."\*

By the advice of the new administration, the King, on the 6th of May, went to the House of Lords with a speech, in which were recommended a reduction of 10,000 men in the army, and an Act of Grace to many persons involved in the late rebellion. Under the circumstances of the country, the former was a very popular, and the latter a very wise measure.

The two other most important proceedings of this Session were the attack upon Lord Cadogan and the re-

\* To Lady Mary W. Montagu. Letters, vol. i. p. 119., ed. 1820.

lease of Lord Oxford. Cadogan, as ambassador to the Hague, had superintended the transporting the Dutch auxiliaries at the time of the rebellion. A charge of fraud and embezzlement in these expenses was now brought forward against him by some of the Jacobite members of Parliament, to whom his zeal and success against the rebels in Scotland had made him peculiarly obnoxious. In this spiteful attack, Shippen might smile to find himself backed by Walpole and Pulteney; the former speaking for nearly two hours, and making such violent exertions that the blood burst from his nose, and that he was obliged to retire from the House. They were answered by Stanhope, Craggs, Lechmere, and several others; and evidence in vindication of Cadogan was given at the Bar.\* Lechmere, who had lately been appointed Attorney-General, observed most truly that the inquiry was altogether frivolous and groundless, and the result of party malice; that it was of the same nature as those which had formerly been levelled against Marlborough, Townshend, and Walpole himself; and that those very persons who were now most clamorous for an inquiry had been wholly silent about these pretended frauds whilst they were in office. Notwithstanding, however, these home-thrusts, the spirit of faction was so strong that the motion was only negatived by a majority of ten.

The proceedings in Lord Oxford's case seemed to partake of his character, and could scarcely have been more slow and dilatory had they been directed by himself. For nearly two years had he now been in confinement, and no progress yet made in his trial. But on a petition from Lord Oxford complaining of the hardship, the business was taken up with vigour. The Lords appointed the 24th of June as the day for it. The Commons renewed the sittings of their Secret Committee; and as it was found that the zeal of Walpole had suddenly cooled on leaving office, and that he almost always absented himself, it became necessary to appoint another chairman in his place. In fact, he and Townshend in their eager-

\* See Lord Cadogan's Case in Boyer's Political State, 1717, vol. i. p. 697—702.



ness to thwart and embarrass the new administration at all risks, were now combining with the Tories to screen their former enemy from justice. They could not, after their own past accusations, openly appear as his defenders ; such a change would have hurt their characters, and perhaps their consciences ; and they accordingly took a more artful course, by inducing Oxford's friend, Lord Harcourt, to propose a specious alteration in the order of proceedings.

When, therefore, the 24th of June had come — when the Peers had assembled in Westminster Hall — when the King, the Royal family, and the foreign Ministers were seated around as spectators — when Oxford, brought from the Tower, stood bare-headed at the Bar, with the fatal axe carried before him — when the articles of impeachment and the Earl's answer had been read — when Hampden had harangued — when Sir Joseph Jekyll had just risen to make good the first article — Harcourt interposed, and stated that before the Managers proceeded further he had a motion to make. The Peers accordingly adjourned to their own House, where Lord Harcourt represented “that going through all the articles of impeachment would take up a great deal of time to very little purpose. For if the Commons could make good the two articles for high treason, the Earl of Oxford would forfeit both life and estate, and there would be an end of the matter ; whereas, the proceeding in the method the Commons proposed would draw the trial into a prodigious length.” He also observed “that a Peer, on his trial on articles for misdemeanours only, ought not to be deprived of his liberty nor sequestered from Parliament, and is entitled to the privilege of sitting within the Bar during the whole time of his trial ; in all which particulars the known rule in such cases may be evaded should a Peer be brought to his trial on several articles of misdemeanours and of high treason mixed together, and the Commons be admitted to make good the former before judgment be given on the latter.”\* Harcourt, therefore, moved that the House

\* This argument is more fully reported in the subsequent Lords' Reasons. (Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 459.)



should receive no evidence on the charges for misdemeanours until after the charges of high treason were determined, it being well known to the whole Privy Council, as we learn from Townshend's own letters, that there was not sufficient evidence to convict Lord Oxford of that crime.\* The motion of Harcourt was warmly opposed by Sunderland, Coningsby, Cadogan, and other Ministerial speakers; but, being supported by many plausible arguments, by the whole force of the Tories, and by the influence and authority of the late Whig Premier, it was carried by a majority of 88 against 56.

This Resolution, of which a high Constitutional authority observes that it was "hardly conformable to precedent, to analogy, or to the dignity of the House of Commons,"† was warmly resented by that House: they considered it an infringement of their privileges, and refused to comply with it. This was the very result which the secret partisans of Oxford had expected and desired. Several messages and explanations which passed between the two Houses served, as in private quarrels, only to widen the breach; and the Lords persevering, appointed the 1st of July for the trial. The Commons, on their part, determined not to maintain the prosecution on those terms. Thus, when on the day fixed the Lords assembled in Westminster Hall, no prosecutor appeared; and the noble judges, after sitting still a quarter of an hour, returned to their own House. A motion was then made, that as no charge had been maintained against Robert Earl of Oxford, and Earl Mortimer, he should be acquitted; and this motion, after some debate, was carried—a sentence which is said to have been hailed with loud cheers by the multitude.‡ The Commons, on their part, could only address the Crown that Oxford might be ex-

\* Townshend to Stanhope, Nov. 2. 1716.

† Hallam's Const. Hist., vol. iii. p. 313. See also Hatsell's Precedents, vol. iv. p. 286.

‡ "The acclamations were as great as upon any occasion; and our friend, who seems more formed for adversity than prosperity, has at present many more friends than ever he had before in any part of his life. I believe he will not have the fewer from a message he received this morning from the King by my Lord Chamberlain, to forbid him the Court."—Erasmus Lewis to Swift, July 2. 1717.

cepted from the Act of Grace; but the Earl was, of course, released from the Tower, and the Commons never renewed their impeachment against him.

Amongst the Peers most keen in pressing the impeachment of Oxford, and most mortified at his acquittal, was the Duke of Marlborough, and we might blame the hero as unduly vindictive, did we not remember that he was blindly uxorious, and that the Duchess abhorred the fallen Minister with even more than her usual force of hatred. It has, however, been asserted, on the contrary, (the evidence is traditionary, but respectable,) that Marlborough, in secret, earnestly promoted the acquittal of Oxford; the Earl having obtained possession of some letter signed by the Duke before the death of Queen Anne, in favour of the Pretender, which letter Oxford threatened to use, if driven to extremity. There are, however, two different and incompatible versions of the story, and the testimony of Oxford's secretary may be considered almost decisive against its truth.\* Nor, in my opinion, does much historical interest attach to it; for that Marlborough had communications with the exiled family nearly to the close of Queen Anne's reign, is certain from other evidence; and whether or not any paper on the subject may have fallen into the hands of his enemies, is a point of very subordinate importance.

Another fact, of much greater moment, and of absolute certainty, is established by a letter amongst the Stuart Papers. Stung with indignation at the harsh treatment he had received from the House of Hanover, Oxford wrote from the Tower to the Pretender promising his services, and giving his advice on the management of the Jacobite affairs.†

The Act of Grace and Free Pardon was the last measure of this Session. By its merciful provisions the Earl

\* "Possibly they may keep Lord Oxford another year in prison, "which my Lord Marlborough seems passionately to desire." (Lewis to Swift, June 15. 1717.) "My Lady Marlborough is almost distracted that she could not obtain her revenge." (The same, July 2. 1717.) For the tradition see the Biogr. Brit. art. Churchill, in second edition, and Coxe's Marlborough, vol. vi. p. 352.

† Lord Oxford to the Pretender, Sept. 1716. This letter was seen by Sir James Mackintosh at Carlton House.

of Carnwath, Lords Widdrington and Nairn, were released from the Tower; seventeen gentlemen under sentence of death in Newgate, and twenty-six in Carlisle Castle, were set at liberty; many likewise from the Fleet, the Marshalsea, and in the custody of messengers. At Chester about two hundred of the prisoners of Preston were set free; in Scotland all persons remaining in the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling received the same benefit; and in short, the prison doors were thrown open in both kingdoms. Besides the Earl of Oxford, there were some other exceptions named, especially Lord Harcourt, Prior, and Thomas Harley; but on the whole, no Act of Grace, in like circumstances, had, for ages past, been clogged with fewer.\* In fact, the gradual advance of humane and merciful principles in our legislation, the progressive respect for human life, and aversion to human sufferings — are most cheering and delightful to contemplate. Even the very clemency of one age appears cruelty to the more compassionate feelings of the next. When in Elizabeth's reign, for example, the great Lord Burleigh signs a warrant for torturing on the rack, or disembowelling some suspected persons, and gives orders that it shall be done "as charitably as such a thing can be," his contemporaries admire the kindness of the reservation, whilst we can see only the barbarity of the sentence. Thus also in the Act of Grace of 1717, so highly extolled for its mercy, a modern reader is shocked to find excepted "all and every person of the name and clan of Macgregor."

It is to be observed, however, that the Act of Grace by no means reversed the past attainders, nor restored the forfeited estates, the yearly income of which in Scotland was about 30,000*l.*, and in England 48,000*l.*

At the close of the Session, the First Lord of the Treasury was raised to the Peerage by the title of Viscount Stanhope. I have already had occasion to notice that

\* An abstract of the Act is given in the *Political State*, 1717, vol. ii. p. 59—72. One contemporary pamphlet carries its adulation to such a pitch of blasphemy as to say that the "clemency of King George" was not only great, but even extended farther than that of God "himself!" (*Tindal's Hist.* vol. vii. p. 160.) The reverse of the picture may be seen in *Lockhart's Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 5.

until the Septennial Act had taken full effect, and had raised the House of Commons into greater power and dignity, hardly any care seems to have been taken by any government to retain some of its leading members in that House. Harley, St. John, and Stanhope, are strong contemporary instances of this indifference. By the promotion of the latter, the Ministerial lead in the Commons devolved upon Addison, Craggs, and Aislabie — men without sufficient official experience or Parliamentary weight — who do not seem to have been entrusted with the direction, and scarcely even with the knowledge, of the more important affairs — who only defended what others had decided upon — who were not so much Ministers as deputies and agents for Ministers; insomuch that we find Craggs sometimes designated as merely “Lord Sunderland’s man.”

The close of the Session left Ministers at leisure to devote their whole attention to foreign politics, which continued to bear an uncertain and lowering aspect. At this period, the chief danger seemed to lie in the Peninsula. The Court of Lisbon, indeed, gave no uneasiness. John the Fifth was then slumbering on the throne of Portugal, and his long reign from 1707 to 1750 was the usual reign of a weak Prince in a Catholic country — the government of the King’s mistress when the King is young, and the government of the King’s confessor when the King is old. But, at Madrid, the equally feeble mind of King Philip was sustained and strengthened by the genius of Alberoni, one of the most remarkable characters of this age, who, by birth the son of a labouring gardener, and in calling a village curate, had, partly by eminent abilities, and partly by low buffooneries\*, (I ought also to add, favourable fortune,) risen to a Cardinal in the Roman Church and Prime Minister of the Spanish Monarchy. The Queen entirely governed Philip, but Alberoni governed the Queen. Under his skilful direction, Spain began to resume its ancient position amongst nations. Trade revived, order and economy were introduced in the finances, a new navy was created, the army became

\* See in St. Simon (Mem. vol. v. p. 40. ed. 1829) how he first gained the favour of Vendôme.

disciplined and well commanded. "Let your Majesty remain but five years at peace," said he to his master, "and I will make you the most powerful monarch in Europe."\* Mr. Bubb, the British Minister at Madrid, observes in like manner that, "as low as Spain is, there is no nation can so soon retrieve itself, and sooner at present than ever. Formerly the dominions in Italy and Flanders were a vast charge to them instead of an advantage. They were maintained by the resources of the Indies and of the two Castilles, whereas at present this expense is at an end; the Castilles pay rather more than ever, while the King draws considerable resources from Aragon and Catalonia, which paid little or nothing before.† In fact, his resources exceed by one third those of any of his predecessors, and his expenses are reduced one half; so that, with a little order, he will soon make himself an useful ally."‡ Nothing, in fact, can show more strongly the general misgovernment of Spain than the sudden prosperity and power to which an able Minister has sometimes been able to raise it, and the glory of such statesmen is the disgrace of its usual system of despotic rule.

Alberoni at first did not want inclination as well as means to become a most useful ally to England. He found, in 1715, at the commencement of his power, some commercial negotiations pending between that country and Spain; and it was chiefly through his influence that

\* See Alberoni's apology in the Historical Register, 1722, p. 201. This is an able defence, full of important facts, but going rather too much into detail. A Prime Minister vindicating his public conduct might have disdained to boast that "he was at the sole charge of curing fifteen girls who were all sick of a contagious distemper!" (p. 203.)

† In 1701, Louis the Fourteenth truly observes in his instructions to Count Marsin, "L'Aragon ne donnerait pas le moindre secours pour les besoins les plus pressans de la Castille." (Mém. de Noailles, vol. ii. p. 108.)

‡ Mr. Bubb to Secretary Stanhope, Feb. 19. 1715. This is fully confirmed by San Phelipe: "Verdaderamente, Alberoni dio a ver las fuerzas de la Monarquia Española, quando sea bien administrado el Erario, siendo indubitabile que gastos tan excesivos en tan breve tiempo ningun Rey Catolico ha podido hacerlos." (Comentarios, vol. ii. p. 167, &c.)



they were brought to a successful issue. A previous treaty of commerce with the Archduke, as King of Spain, had been concluded by Stanhope at Barcelona, in 1707, on most advantageous terms; but this, of course, had fallen with the Austrian cause. In the new treaty with Spain, signed in December, 1715, Stanhope obtained very large concessions; restoring British subjects to the same advantages in trade which they enjoyed under the Austrian Kings, and providing that they should in no case pay higher or other duties than the Spaniards themselves.\* In the same conciliatory spirit, Alberoni, during the rebellion in Scotland, avoided any open countenance or support to the Pretender; and even published a proclamation in the name of Philip, declaring His Majesty's intention to give no assistance to the enemies of George. "Next to God," once said Alberoni to Mr. Bubb, "the King my master looks up to yours."† The friendly disposition of the Spanish and British Ministers was still further improved by a personal correspondence which sprung up between them. Stanhope, while a prisoner at Zaragoza, had become acquainted with Alberoni, who was then an humble attendant of the Duke of Vendome‡; and even at that period Stanhope, struck with his abilities, had foretold his future greatness. He now wrote to Alberoni, expressing pleasure to see his anticipations fulfilled — thanks for Alberoni's exertions towards the Commercial Treaty — and wishes for a sincere and lasting friendship between the two Courts.§ Alberoni replied in a similar strain; and the correspondence then

\* The treaty of Stanhope with Charles the Third, in 1707, may be seen in Martens' Supplem., vol. i. p. 64.; and that with Philip the Fifth in 1715, *ibid.* p. 111. Mr. Bubb writes to Stanhope, Dec. 12. 1715, "The Ministry here have done every thing they could against us . . . . Whatever we settled with the King in the morning, the Cardinal del Giudice and his party undid at night . . . . Alberoni "has behaved very obligingly and heartily in this affair."

† Mr. Bubb to Secretary Stanhope, May 4. 1716.

‡ Alberoni, in his apology, boasts that it was he who persuaded Vendome to accept the command in 1710, and also to move forward from Bayonne when the Duke was deterred by an attack of gout, and by the news of the battle of Zaragoza. (*Hist. Register*, 1722, p. 200.)

§ Stanhope to Alberoni, Dec. 30. 1715.



begun was continued on a very confidential footing, thus excluding, in fact, from business Monteleon, the Spanish Ambassador at London, who was wholly in the Pretender's interest.

This mutual cordiality was not, however, of very long continuance. In proportion as the power of Alberoni increased, his views of policy expanded, and they at length became irreconcilable with those of England. It is the usual fault of adventurers, if raised to the head of affairs, to embrace too many projects at once — to prefer the shining to the solid — and to pursue in public affairs the same daring and hazardous course which led to their own personal advancement. Alberoni was eager to depress the party of the Regent in France, and entered warmly into the cabals against the authority of his Royal Highness by the Duke du Maine and other malcontents. Another favourite object was to humble the Emperor, who had never yet acknowledged Philip as King of Spain — who still retained that title for himself, and assigned that of Prince of Asturias to his infant son \* — who had formed at Vienna a council of Spanish exiles — and who above all, under the peace of Utrecht, held all the former Spanish dominions in Italy. Besides the natural desire of regaining these, the Queen of Spain, as a Princess of Parma, had claims to the eventual succession of that Duchy and of Tuscany, and was most anxious to acquire the guarantee of them for one of the Infants. "In short," concludes Mr. Bubb, "the absolute control over Spain will belong to the highest bidder for the Queen's son. This is the grand and the only maxim which has never changed since I have been here."†

With these views, it may easily be conceived that the Court of Spain was deeply mortified to see the conclusion of the defensive treaty between England and the Emperor. The guarantee of territory which it contained, affording a strong additional security to the Italian provinces, was peculiarly unwelcome; but still far greater pain and indignation were excited at Madrid on the news of the

\* San Phelipe Coment. vol. ii. p. 166. The young prince died in 1717, the same year Maria Theresa was born.

† Mr. Bubb to Secretary Stanhope, June 15. 1716.

Triple Alliance, thus checking any designs upon France even more directly than those upon Italy. There was still every disposition, on the part of England, to cultivate the most friendly intercourse with Spain; but this was no longer in accordance with the ambitious designs of Alberoni. From this time forward he appears to have changed his whole system; and, though still holding a conciliatory tone towards England, he suspended the execution of the Treaty of Commerce, and connived at the vexations practised upon English merchants; while, moreover, he decidedly rejected some proposals from England to bring about an accommodation between Spain and the Emperor.

Alberoni, however, was by no means anxious for war; he still wished, on the contrary, to avoid an open rupture; he felt the necessity of the five years of quiet he had asked for his reforms, and saw the danger of plunging into hostilities against powerful allies, and with imperfect preparations. But one very slight incident baffled his pacific views. Don Joseph Molines, then ambassador at Rome, having been appointed Inquisitor-General of Spain, had set out on his journey by land with a passport from the Pope, and a promise of security from the Imperial Minister. Nevertheless, he was arrested on his way by the Austrians, and conveyed to the citadel of Milan; while his papers were transmitted to Vienna, with the hope of their affording intelligence as to the designs of the Spanish Cabinet. This insult, after so many other causes of complaint, real or supposed, was the last drop that made the waters of bitterness overflow. Philip and his Queen, highly incensed, would no longer hear of any objections to a war, and overbore the real reluctance of their favourite Minister.\*

Alberoni had, in fact, sufficient difficulties and dangers on his hands at home. His bold innovations had raised a whole host of enemies; and at this very time a plot

\* Some high authorities, such as San Phelipe (vol. ii. p. 151.), the *Mémoires de Noailles* (vol. v. p. 74.), &c., treat the reluctance of Alberoni as mere affectation, and himself as the sole cause of war. But the contrary is, I think, satisfactorily proved by Coxe (*Memoirs of the House of Bourbon*, vol. ii. p. 275.).

was forming against him by one of the most distinguished generals in the Spanish army, and one of the most steady adherents to Philip during the war of the succession, the Marquis de Villadarias. The confederates of Villadarias were Don Joseph Rodrigo, the President of Castille, and some thirty of his most devoted officers; and his project was a partial rising, to combine the principal cities and the superior courts and councils, for a joint representation to the King, and for the dismissal of the obnoxious Minister. The French ambassador, when secretly consulted by Villadarias, thought the enterprise too hazardous\*, nor does it seem to have proceeded: at least I find no further account of it; and when Spain had become actually engaged in war, the noble spirit of Villadarias would not refuse to serve his country even in a subaltern capacity, and under the direction of his political enemy; and I shall have to speak of his gallantry as one of the Generals in the second Spanish expedition.

War being once inevitable, Alberoni bent all his energies to its successful prosecution. He did not act like some preceding Spanish Ministers, who, in difficult circumstances, had done nothing for themselves, and appeared to rely entirely on their saints, or their allies. He sent his chief secretary and confidant, Don Joseph Patiño, to hasten the preparations at Barcelona, where the soldiers and the ships were collecting. The whole force amounted only to twelve ships of war and 8600 men; but, in a period of profound peace in the south, even these excited considerable alarm, and no less conjecture throughout Europe. Of their aim and object nothing was known, and therefore much was reported. The Emperor trembled for Naples, the Genoese for Savona, and the King of Sicily for that island; in England it was feared that the Spaniards would send over the Pretender;

\* St. Aignan to Louville, June 1. 1717, *Mémoires de Louville*. Villadarias had previously been to Paris to concert measures with the French statesmen. Louville wrote to St. Aignan, April 18. 1717, "Villadarias retourne à Madrid. Il est au fait de tous nos secrets. Confiez-vous à lui, mais ne le voyez point en public. Il est de ces vrais Espagnols qui veulent une alliance offensive et défensive avec la France, mais qui la veulent uniquement dans l'intérêt de leur Prince et de leur pays."

while the Pope piously believed that all these preparations were levelled against the Infidels in the Levant. In fact, one principal reason for this mystery was to impose upon his Holiness, who had not yet consented to bestow upon Alberoni the much desired Roman purple; but that favour having been wrung from the reluctant Pontiff in July, the new Cardinal immediately threw aside the mask. Orders were given for the sailing of the expedition; its command was entrusted to the Marquis de Lede, and on the 20th of August its real object was disclosed by its anchoring in the Bay of Cagliari.

The island of Sardinia, consisting chiefly of marshes or of mountains, has, from the earliest period to the present, been cursed with a noxious air, an ill cultivated soil, and a scanty population. The convulsions produced by its poisonous plants gave rise to the expression of Sardoniac smile, which is as old as Homer\*, and even at present the civilisation of the surrounding continent has never yet extended to its shores. The people are still almost in a savage state; and I do not remember any man of any note or eminence who was ever born amongst them, unless it be the historian of this very expedition.† This barren territory, for centuries a dependency of Spain, had been secured to the Emperor at the same time that Victor Amadeus obtained the far more fruitful island of Sicily. Of late, however, a prospect of exchanging the first for the latter had been held out to the Emperor by the members of the Triple Alliance, in hopes to obtain his accession; and it was partly with the view of baffling this negotiation, and partly as a step to future conquests in Italy, that Alberoni made Sardinia the first object of his arms.

The Spanish troops experienced no difficulty in landing, nor much in the investment of Cagliari. But they met with a stubborn resistance in its siege, the place

\* Odyss. lib. xx. v. 302.

† San Phelipe, Coment. vol. ii. p. 158—165. He was present with the Spanish army, and took an active part in the cause of Philip, as he had also done in 1708. (War of the Succession, p. 252.) He is obliged to cwn of his native island, "Nada perdio el Emperador con "Cerdeña; nada gano el vencedor."

being garrisoned chiefly by some Aragonese and Catalans of the Austrian party, who combined on this occasion the common rancour of exiles with the proverbial courage of their countrymen.\* They defended themselves to the last extremity; and even when they had surrendered, the island was not yet subdued. The Spaniards had to march forty leagues to the northward to form the sieges of Alghero† and of Castel Aragonese‡; they suffered severe loss from the pestilential vapours in the midst of the summer heats, and more than two months elapsed before their conquest was entirely completed; when the Marquis de Lede, leaving 3000 men as a garrison, returned with the rest to Barcelona.

There is no doubt that, instead of returning homewards, the Spanish expedition would at once have proceeded to Sicily, had not England interposed at the first news of its aggression. The King of England was pledged to maintain the neutrality of Italy, and bound besides by a defensive treaty with the Emperor. Above all, the great object of the Triple Alliance had been the preservation of peace in Europe; and the allies were determined to spare no labour nor firmness for that end. Dubois hastened over to London, to hold some confidential interviews with Stanhope. It was determined to make every exertion to mediate between Philip and Charles; and according to the plan laid down, the former was to renounce all claims on the Italian provinces, and the latter on the Spanish monarchy; the Emperor

\* The Aragonese were proverbial for their valour amongst the Spaniards. Thus in *Don Quixote*: — “ganar fama sobre todos los caballeros Aragoneses que seria ganarla sobre todos los del Mundo.” (Part 2. ch. 4. vol. v. p. 79., ed. Paris, 1814.) I remember at Madrid seeing a worthy Castillian very testy at this passage.

† Alghero was founded in the twelfth century by the Doria family. The fortifications are still kept in good repair, and there are some fine brass guns with the inscription “Parant hæc fulmina pacem.” (Smyth’s *Sardinia*, p. 281.)

‡ This is now called Castel Sardo. “It occupies the summit of a steep rocky pinnacle immediately over the sea.” (Smyth’s *Sardinia*, p. 261.) The place is no favourite with Capt. Smyth; he tells us that “like the Carse of Gowrie, it may be said to want water all the summer, fire all the winter, and the grace of God all the year “through!”



was to be gratified with the acquisition of Sicily in exchange for Sardinia; and the King of Spain with the succession to Parma, and to the whole or nearly the whole of Tuscany, for the Infant Don Carlos. These offers, being a tolerably fair and impartial award for each of the contending parties, were, of course, bitterly opposed by both. It was hoped, however, that, backed by so formidable a confederacy as the Triple Alliance, they would be finally accepted; and, in order to give them greater weight at Madrid, Stanhope despatched his cousin, Colonel William Stanhope (since created Earl of Harrington), as ambassador to Spain. The Regent, soon afterwards, sent thither the Marquis de Nancreé in the same character; but the tone both of France and of Holland, in this negotiation, was far less earnest and effectual than that of England, the Regent being withheld by the affinity which had so lately subsisted in politics, and which still subsisted in blood, between the two branches of the House of Bourbon. "I have been "shown the instructions for M. de Nancreé," writes Lord Stair: "they are certainly drawn in the most guarded "and cautious terms that I have ever seen. No man "could touch fire with more unwillingness and circum- "spection than these instructions touch every point that "could give the slightest chagrin to Spain. M. de Nan- "cré is to say nothing savouring of threat . . . . Nor "has he any orders to insist upon a declaration that the "Spaniards will not, in the meanwhile, undertake an in- "vasion of Italy. Yet, in my opinion, there is no way "to avoid a war so sure as seeming not to be afraid of "it."\* "As to the Dutch," observes Stair, in another despatch, "they will gladly accede whenever they find us "concur with the Emperor; but their weak and pitiable "state of government prevents them from engaging in "any thing of vigour, unless they find themselves in good "and large company."†

Nor were there fewer difficulties with the Court of Vienna. St. Simon assures us that the Emperor had

\* Lord Stair to Lord Stanhope, Paris, March 6. 1718. (Orig. in French.)

† To Lord Stanhope, March 11. 1718. (Orig. in French.)

such strong personal repugnance to resign his claims upon the Spanish monarchy, that his Ministers scarcely durst mention the subject before him.\* I find it stated, however, in the instructions to Colonel Stanhope, "that the Emperor at first had showed no want of readiness to conclude a peace with Spain. He agreed to yield the succession of Parma; but, in spite of the most pressing entreaties from His Majesty, and from the Regent, he positively refused the dominions of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Even while the war with the Turks seemed likely to continue, the Emperor and his Ministers seemed immovable on this point. But now, when it is evident that the Emperor may at his pleasure conclude a peace, or at least a long truce, with the Turks, the King our master, and the Regent, are apprehensive that the Imperial Court will be still more difficult to deal with than before."

Temporal enemies were not the only ones roused against Alberoni by his conquest of Sardinia. The Pope, swayed by Austrian counsels, and indignant at having been duped by the Spanish Minister, launched forth an angry Brief to Philip, threatening him with the "divine vengeance," and assuring him that "not only your reputation, but your soul also is at stake;"† and he backed these spiritual remonstrances by a suspension of the *INDULTO*, or ecclesiastical tax, in the Peninsula. This brief was publicly circulated throughout Spain, but was treated with utter contempt by the Minister; and the *Indulto* was strictly levied as before. It is remarkable that one of the very few serious differences between the Spanish Court and the Holy See should have occurred with a Cardinal as Prime Minister; and it is still more strange that, in a country so blindly devoted to the Catholic faith as Spain, the Papal indignation should have produced so little effect. Is it that the Spaniards are still more zealous for their country than for their religion, and, even in matters of faith, look rather to Madrid than to Rome? I find it stated that, at this period, even the statues of Saints could not please them unless attired in the true Spanish habit!‡

\* Mem. vol. xv. 328. ed. 1829.

† See the Brief at length in the *Historical Register*, 1717, p. 357.

‡ See the *Travels of Father Labat*, who visited Cadiz in 1705, and

The representations of Colonel Stanhope and of M. de Nancré were met by Alberoni first with anger, and afterwards with dissimulation. In one of his private letters he inveighs against "certain unprincipled men, who "would cut and pare states and kingdoms as though "they were so many Dutch cheeses;"\* nevertheless, after a vain struggle for the cession of Sardinia, he sullenly consented to open a negotiation on the basis of the proposed preliminaries. But it soon became apparent that his object was only to gain time and to spread divisions. Under his orders, the most active measures were in progress for another armament. Ships of war were built in the Spanish ports, or bought in foreign ones†; the foundries of cannon at Pamplona, and the manufactories of arms in Biscay, sent forth the din of preparation; soldiers were enlisted in all quarters; the irregular valour of the Miquelets in Catalonia was raised and improved by discipline; and no less than six regiments were formed from those hardy mountaineers. In order to obtain money for this armament Alberoni did not, as he boasts himself, lay any tax upon the people; but mortgaged some revenues, enforced the strictest economy, sold some offices at Court, and stinted the Queen's personal expenses, insomuch that Her Majesty afterwards complained of not having been allowed "sufficient to

who says of one of its churches, "Sainte Anne qui est d'un côté "du berceau de l'Enfant Jesus, est habillée comme une vieille dame, "d'une grande robe de velours avec des dentelles d'or. Elle est assise "sur un carreau à la manière du pays, et tient son chapelet à la main. "St. Joseph est à côté de Sainte Anne vêtu à l'Espagnole, les culottes "le pourpoint et le manteau de damas noir, avec la golille, les bas de "soie avec la rose de rubans de la même couleur, les cheveux partagés "sur le côté de la tête et poudrés, des grandes lunettes sur le nez, le "chapeau à forme plate sous le bras gauche, l'épée de longueur, et le "poignard avec un très-grand chapelet à la main droite!" (Voyages, vol. i. p. 23.) In the same volume is a curious story of the monks of Cadiz, who, it seems, never attended the midnight Mass prescribed by their rules, although the bells for it were still rung every night, as they said, "pour l'édification du peuple!"

\* To Mr. Bubb. Printed from the Melcombe Papers in the original French in Seward's *Anecdotes*, vol. iii. p. 255. ed. 1804.

† "This Court has contracted for the timber and all other necessaries "for the building of three ships in Catalonia, and eight in Cantabria, "and six from 60 to 80 guns they have bought of the Dutch; so that

“provide common necessaries”\* — words which, from such a quarter, may perhaps mean only jewels and trinkets! In short, there was no doubt that Alberoni persevered in his aspiring hopes, and that the return of summer would be marked by a renewal of his warlike enterprises.

To withstand the confederacy of France England and Holland, and to dare at the same time the enmity of the Court of Vienna, might have appalled the boldest Spanish statesman in the proudest days of the monarchy; but, even in its decline and abasement, did not daunt the lofty soul of Alberoni. His active armaments at home were combined with skilful negotiations abroad. He enticed Victor Amadeus by holding out a prospect of the Milanese as an equivalent for Sicily; he encouraged the Turks to continue their war against the Emperor in spite of their defeats; he made overtures to Prince Ragotzky, the exiled Prince of Transylvania, and urged him to attempt the recovery of his dominions. In the north of Europe he adopted the views of Gortz, and had grounds to expect that Charles the Twelfth and the Czar, concluding a peace, and forgetting their old animosities, would combine against George the First for the restoration of the exiled family. The commercial jealousy of the Dutch was stirred anew by the intrigues of Alberoni. The factions in France were taken under his fostering care; he caballed to raise an insurrection of the discontented in Brittany, and of the Protestants in the Cevennes; and made overtures to the secret parties of the Jesuits, of the Parliaments, and of the Duke and Duchess du Maine. The convocation of the States-General, the immediate reformation of abuses, the speedy payment of the public debts — all popular measures, and the more so as being some of them impracticable — were

“they pretend to have a numerous squadron at sea next year. One “Castañeta, a sea officer, and a builder, is gone to Holland to take “care of their purchase; these six ships they will certainly have, and, “if we allow them, six more.” — Mr. Bubb to Lord Stanhope, Nov. 14. 1717. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxvii.

\* This was said in 1725. See Mr. Keene’s despatch as quoted in Coxe’s *House of Bourbon*, vol. ii. p. 392.

professed as objects by his emissaries; and the seeds were ready laid of a wide and alarming conspiracy.

But it was against England, as the soul and spirit of the whole confederacy, that the Cardinal more especially directed his batteries. Besides his northern negotiations, he entered into a direct correspondence with the Pretender, who, in consequence of the Triple Alliance, had been compelled to cross the Alps, and who had fixed his temporary residence at Rome. An expedition to the British coasts, conveying a sufficient body of troops, and to be headed by Ormond or by James himself, stood foremost amongst the schemes of Alberoni. Meanwhile he availed himself to the utmost of the divisions in England; his agents and creatures publishing specious declamations on the burden of taxes, the dangers of a standing army, the losses of trade which must follow a rupture with Spain, and other such popular topics; and finding, unhappily, not merely the Tories, but also some of the Whigs in opposition, eagerly second their efforts to agitate and inflame the public mind.

Such unwearied and combined exertions threatened the most serious danger, and required the most active measures; but before I come to the steps adopted by the British Government for its defence, I must resume the thread of our domestic affairs.



## CHAPTER IX.

WHILE the coldness between George the First and his son had been merely a Court secret, or a public surmise, it produced comparatively little mischief; but when it grew into an avowed and open breach, followed by a change of residence, and authenticated by published letters, it became a much more momentous affair. The jealousy and suspicion of the King, the forwardness and caballing of the Prince, have been already mentioned in this narrative, and from a very slight spark, their smouldering resentments blazed high. On the christening of one of the Prince's children, the Prince had designed his uncle, the Duke of York, as godfather; but, by the King's commands, the Duke of Newcastle stood in that relation at the ceremony, not as proxy for the Duke of York, but in his own behalf. The Prince incensed at this insolence (so he called it), as soon as the ceremony was over, addressed Newcastle in very harsh and reproachful terms; and the King, offended at this want of respect, ordered his son to remain in his own apartments under arrest, and soon afterwards sent him his commands to quit St. James's. The Prince and Princess accordingly withdrew into the house of the Earl of Grantham, Lord Chamberlain to His Royal Highness. This frivolous dispute, in which the King was certainly severe, the Prince undutiful, and both childish, produced a total alienation between them during several years.\* A notice was issued, that no person who paid his respects to the Prince or Princess would be received at Court; they were deprived of their guard of honour and other distinctions; and the

\* St. Simon, who is always fond of scandal, and not always solicitous as to its truth, does not scruple to say, "*Jamais le père n'avait pu souffrir ce fils, parcequ'il ne le croyait point à lui.*" (*Mém.* vol. xviii. p. 197. ed. 1829.)

Secretary of State wrote a circular to the Foreign Ministers, giving an account of this whole transaction ; nay, to such an extent did the Royal displeasure proceed, that George formed a scheme for obtaining an Act of Parliament by which the Prince, on coming to the throne, should be compelled to relinquish his German states. This project he afterwards laid before Lord Chancellor Parker ; and it was only on the Chancellor's representations of its inexpediency and impracticability, that it was abandoned by His Majesty. On the other hand, the Prince, fixing his residence at Leicester House, openly raised the standard of opposition against his father.

The feverish anxiety produced by this schism in the Royal Family was very apparent during the whole of this Session. It was a subject never touched upon, but always feared and expected in a debate. On one occasion, when the House of Lords was very full and the Prince of Wales present, Lord North and Grey rose, as he said, "to take notice of the great ferment that is in the nation." Here he made a pause, and his hearers were in no small pain and suspense as to what might follow ; but Lord North soon relieved them by mentioning only the great scarcity of silver, and the consequent hindrance of trade.

This scarcity of silver was, in fact, one of the principal matters to which the Parliament of this year directed their attention. The reports on this subject of Sir Isaac Newton, as Master of the Mint, are still on record, and appear interesting from his name, if not from their contents. Lord Stanhope, in his official statement, as head of the Treasury, ascribed the scarcity of silver to three causes ; first, the increasing luxury in relation to plate ; secondly, the vast exports of bullion and other plate to the East Indies ; thirdly, the clandestine trade that had lately been carried on of exporting silver and importing gold to and from Holland, Germany, and other countries. In support of these allegations Stanhope produced several papers, and, among the rest, one drawn up at the Custom House, by which it appeared that in 1717 the East India Company had exported near three millions of ounces of silver, which far exceeded the imports in that year ; so that large quantities of silver specie must necessarily have been melted down, both to make up that export and

to supply silversmiths. He also hinted at "the malice of "some persons, who, by hoarding up silver, thought to "distress the Government;" and declared that, nevertheless, public credit had never yet been so high, for that "the Government could now borrow great sums at three "and a half per cent." On the whole, it was resolved, "that the standard of the gold and silver coins of this "kingdom ought not to be altered in weight, fineness, or "denomination; but that a Bill should be brought in for "the more effectual preventing the melting down of the "coins of this kingdom." I find, however, from the Lords' Journals, that though this Bill was accordingly prepared, and went into committee, it did not pass this Session.

It has often occurred to me to doubt whether our practice of computing sums in gold instead of silver coins — always reckoning by pounds or guineas instead of crown-pieces — has not had a tendency to raise and keep up prices unduly for small purchases. The Duke de Sully carries this idea further; he declares himself convinced by experience that even a crown-piece is too large a value for common computations\*; and, in fact, it may be observed, that, since his time, the French have adopted the reckoning by LIVRES instead of ÉCUS.

The Parliament sat only from the 21st of November to the 21st of March, without much of moment occurring. It is remarkable, that the seceding Whigs do not appear to have gained ground by their open junction with the Tories; and that the Government prevailed against them, on almost every occasion, by larger majorities than during their cabals in office.† The chief question on which the Opposition made a stand this Session was the Mutiny

\* "Je crois avoir fait l'expérience que l'habitude de nommer un "écu faite d'une dénomination plus propre aux petits détails porte "insensiblement toutes les parties du commerce dans les ventes et "dans les achats au-delà de leur vraie valeur." (Mém. de Sully, vol. ii. p. 148. ed. 1747.)

† "Tout est allé dans le Parlement au souhait de notre Roi, qui "n'aura plus d'embarras pour de l'argent pendant toute cette séance. "Aussi les fonds continuent à hausser considérablement." — Lord Stanhope to Abbé Dubois, Dec. 23. 1717. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxvi.

Bill — a good topic for popular declamation, and on which the long experience of Walpole, as Secretary of War, enabled him to speak with peculiar powers of mischief; but it was carried in the Commons by 247 against 229. In the House of Peers, Oxford and Strafford (for the impeachment of the latter had been silently dropped), resuming their places, took a prominent part in the debate; Lord Townshend also spoke against the Bill; and in the division they had 77 votes, and the Government 91. During one discussion Shippen, forgetting his usual caution, was betrayed into the observation, that some of His Majesty's measures were rather calculated for the meridian of Germany than of Great Britain; and that it was the only infelicity of His Majesty's reign that he was unacquainted with our language and constitution. Nothing could be more true than the remark — nothing more mischievous than the intention; and a storm of indignation was immediately raised against the "down-right" Jacobite.\* It was moved that he should be taken into custody; and, though Walpole interposed in favour of his new ally, and dexterously afforded him an opportunity for an explanation, which would probably have been accepted, yet Shippen, disdaining any submission, was sent to the Tower, where he remained during the rest of the Session.

Meanwhile, our relations with Spain had been growing to the critical point described in the foregoing chapter; and the Ministers, on full consideration, foresaw that an English fleet might be required to avert or to resist the designs of Alberoni. For this purpose a Royal Message was delivered to the House of Commons, on nearly the last day of the Session, adverting to the possible necessity of a larger naval force; and a corresponding Address was moved by Sir William Strickland, pledging the House to make good any such excess in the sea-service of 1718, as His Majesty might find requisite to preserve the tranquillity of Europe. Both the Message and the Address cautiously shunned the mention by name of any foreign

\* "I love to pour out all myself as plain

"As *downright* Shippen."

POPE.

Shippen used afterwards to say of Walpole, "Robin and I are two  
"honest men; though he is for King George, and I for King James."

power; but Walpole insidiously observed, that such an Address had all the air of a declaration of war against Spain. It was, however, carried without dividing. Preparations were immediately commenced for a large armament at Portsmouth; its destination to be the Mediterranean, its commander Sir George Byng.

Still, however, it was confidently hoped that negotiations might prevent an appeal to arms; and it was chiefly with the view of effecting this happy result, that a change was made at this period in the office of Secretary of State. Stanhope, from his personal intimacy at the Courts of Paris, Vienna, and the Hague, and his long experience of Spain, was the person who, even when removed to the Treasury, still exercised a paramount influence on our foreign affairs. Dubois, Prince Eugene, and many others, continued to apply to him instead of to Sunderland; he was still looked to by Continental states as the head of the counsels relative to them; and the King likewise relied mainly on him in these affairs. Under such circumstances it was undoubtedly better that he should resume the office which would give him the official and responsible control of our foreign policy; and that the management of our domestic affairs, together with the chief post at the Treasury, should be transferred to Sunderland. Accordingly an exchange of offices took place between the two Ministers; and Stanhope was also, at this period, raised to an Earldom. The office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, which Stanhope had also held, was, however, conferred upon Aislabie.

The other Secretary of State, appointed with Sunderland, had been Addison. That admirable writer, whose works must give instruction and delight to all men capable of either, and whose renown can never cease so long as the English people, or even the English language, endure, unhappily comes before the historian as only a mute at St. Stephen's, and a trifler in Downing Street. Whenever he had to deal with practical and pressing affairs, the razor was found too sharp for the blocks. It has often been related, how, when Secretary to the Lords Justices, and desired to write an official notice of the Queen's death, he was so distracted with the choice of words, and so overwhelmed with the importance of the



crisis, that at length the Lords, losing all patience at his bungling, summoned a common clerk who readily did what was required in the usual form of business. In a higher office his deficiencies were of course still more apparent.\* He himself became painfully sensible of them, and solicited his retirement, which he obtained at this time with a pension of 1500*l.* a year. But ill health (this had been another cause of his official failure) brought his useful life to a close in only fifteen months: he expired at Holland House (then and since a classic spot in English literature), with the memorable words upon his lips, "See in what peace a Christian can die!" His successor, as Secretary of State, was James Craggs, a ready speaker, a good man of business, and a consistent politician.

The Government sustained at this time another loss, and no light one, in Lord Cowper, who resigned the Great Seal. His motive I do not find explicitly stated by others, and his own private Journal does not extend so far.† That he parted from his colleagues on good terms, may be presumed from his being promoted to an Earldom; but I conjecture that the Peerage Bill, and the Act for the relief of Dissenters, which he so strenuously opposed next year, might be already contemplated by the Cabinet, and that Lord Cowper had determined never to concur in them. His health, however, was declining, and his temper had soured, and either of these circumstances might suggest a wish for retirement. His place was occupied, not filled, by Lord Parker, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and afterwards Earl of Macclesfield.

From the usual versatility of the Duke of Shrewsbury, it is doubtful whether his death could be considered a gain or a loss by any political party. He expired this year on the 1st of February.

\* The following is a striking remark by Sir James Mackintosh:—"What a good exchange of stations might have been made by Swift and Addison! Addison would have made an excellent Dean, and "Swift an admirable Secretary of State!" See the *Memoirs of Mackintosh*, by his son, vol. ii. p. 91.—a worthy record of a most accomplished man.

† The last entry in Lord Cowper's Diary is Sept. 21. 1714, and there are but very few in that and the next preceding years.

Charles Talbot, the twelfth Earl of Shrewsbury, was born in 1660, and succeeded to the title at a very early age, his father having been killed in a duel with the Duke of Buckingham.\* The family was then, as at present, Roman Catholic; but the young Earl embraced the Protestant faith so early as 1679, and, by his steady adherence to it in very trying times, incurred the displeasure of King James. He was foremost in the secret schemes against that Prince; and one of the seven who, in June, 1688, signed the celebrated Association, inviting the Prince of Orange. He continued throughout one of the chief promoters of the Revolution; and, as such, was employed as Secretary of State, and raised to a Dukedom by the new sovereign. So polished, engaging, and conciliatory were his manners as to make him in a great measure loved and trusted by both parties, insomuch that William the Third used to call him "the King of Hearts." "I never," says another most acute observer, "knew a man so formed to please, and to gain upon the affection while challenging the esteem."† He appears, moreover, to have combined considerable talents with upright intentions; but his temper was timid and shrinking; he was averse to business from his disposition, and unequal to it from his health. "If," as he says himself, "a man cannot bear the air of London four days in a year, he must make a very scurvy figure in a Court as well as in a Ministry."‡ His delicate mind also, like his body, was not made for the wear and tear of politics, as is truly and beautifully expressed in a letter to himself from Lord Halifax: "I confess I always thought there was too much fine silver in your Grace's temperament; had you been made of a coarser alloy, you had been better

\* See an account of this duel in Pepys's Diary, January 17. 1668. Lady Shrewsbury was the Duke of Buckingham's mistress, and is said to have held his horse in the dress of a page whilst he was fighting her husband.

† Lord Bolingbroke to Lord Orrery, May 18. 1711. Marlborough compares his manner to Eugene's in one of his letters. "Prince Eugene has in his conversation a great deal of my Lord Shrewsbury, with the advantage of seeming franker." (To the Duchess, June 15. 1704.)

‡ Letter to King William, December 10. 1698, printed in Coxe's Correspondence, p. 181.

"fitted for public life."\* Accordingly, during the whole term of his administration under King William, we find him almost unceasingly applying to His Majesty for permission to resign. His value, however, as the only man who could soften and combine the fierce partisans of that mortifying period was so much felt by William, that no prince ever showed greater reluctance to dispense with the services of a subject, and that his importunity did not prevail till 1700, when he resigned all his offices; and, hoping to restore his health by quiet and a purer air, proceeded to Rome, and resided there five years. On his return, passing through Augsburg, he contracted or announced a marriage with the Marchesa Paleotti, his Italian mistress. Having reached England, he resided chiefly in the country, at his seat of Heythorp; but renewed his former intimacy and political union with the Whigs, leaving his proxy with the Duke of Marlborough, and declaring that thus placed he thought his vote more sure to be employed for the public good than were he present to give it.† But this good understanding soon became disturbed. He was nettled at the coldness with which the Duchess of Marlborough, and other Whig ladies, treated his foreign wife‡, and he was no less offended at failing to obtain from the Whig Ministers some object of personal ambition for himself; the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, according to one account—a pension, according to another. At this period of displeasure with his former friends, he became entangled in the subtle snares of Harley; he privately entered into all the cabals of that crafty statesman and of his bed-cham-

\* Letter without precise date, but written in 1705, and printed in the *Correspondence*, p. 655.

† He observes in one of his letters at this time, "I own it is hard at first to choose one's friendships well, but when they are once fixed upon a merit like the Duke of Marlborough, and their worth experienced, it is past my comprehending how that should ever be lessened or shaken." (See *Coxe's Marlborough*, vol. v. p. 212.)

‡ The Duchess writes to Lady Cowper, Oct. 23. 1710: "Your description of the Duchess of Shrewsbury is very good. I have heard much such an account of her, only with this addition: my Lord Duke looking a little grave, she chucked him under the chin, bidding him look up, amongst all the company! She is a great honour to a Court!"

ber ally ; and he had secret conferences with the Queen at Windsor, on subjects not confided to her Ministers. Still, however, with his characteristic doubt and timidity, he avoided committing himself, or making any decided movement, until perfectly assured of the ascendancy of Mrs. Masham. He then took his seat in the House of Lords, and boldly defended the cause of Sacheverell against the Ministry. Nor was this all. The Queen availed herself of an interval, when Parliament was prorogued, Marlborough commanding in Flanders, and Godolphin betting at Newmarket, to deprive the Marquis of Kent of the Chamberlain's staff, and intrust it to Shrewsbury. Complaint and remonstrance proved unavailing ; and this first step was followed up until the utter overthrow of the Whig administration, and the establishment of the Tories, with whom Shrewsbury then combined. Though retaining his office of Lord Chamberlain, he was appointed to that of ambassador at Paris, from whence, in the autumn of 1713, he was, as I have already had occasion to state, transferred to the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland.

The year 1717 is remarkable as the last on which the Houses of Convocation ever sat. From the Restoration to the Revolution, that assembly had been very inefficient either for good or for evil ; and Bishop Burnet sarcastically observes of it in 1689, that "ever since 1662, the " Convocation had continued to sit, but to do no business ; so that they were kept at no small charge to do " nothing, but only to meet and read a Latin litany."\* Since that period, however, and especially in the reign of Anne†, they had at intervals displayed great activity and most violent wrangling, the two Houses being almost always on bad terms with one another. On the accession of George the First, the Convocation was permitted to hold its sittings as usual. But it was not long before the Lower House plunged eagerly into a contention with Dr. Hoadley, Bishop of Bangor, who, in a sermon on the spiritual kingdom of Christ, had used expressions tending, it was alleged, "to subvert all government and discipline in the Church ;" and also "to impugn and

\* Hist. vol. ii. p. 33. fol. ed.

† Somerville's Queen Anne, p. 81. and 124.

“impeach the Royal Supremacy in causes ecclesiastical.” This debate, known by the name of the Bangorian Controversy, would supply materials enough for a volume, but hardly interest enough for a page; and it may be sufficient for most readers to state, that the Government, anxious to compose these dissensions, and prevent any appearance of a schism in the Church, arrested the proceedings by a sudden prorogation, since which the Convocation has never met again for business. Several good and wise men have deplored the cessation; and it is certainly possible that the frequent holding of this assembly might have checked the progress of dissent, and more early provided sufficient space and means for religious worship. But it is at least equally probable that its disputes would sometimes have widened into schism, its zeal warmed into intolerance; that the trade of agitator might have grown profitable in the church as it is in the state; and that the enemies of all religion would often have been gratified with the unseemly sight of conflicting divines.

The British negotiations at Madrid continued, but did not advance. In vain did Colonel Stanhope and Nancré combine their efforts — in vain did the latter receive new and more effectual instructions from the Regent; in vain did Lord Stanhope urge Alberoni in private letters — the Cardinal maintained the same haughty tone as if Spain still held in its hands the balance of European power.\* The project of peace he termed an unheard-of monster, a goat-stag†, and the peace of Utrecht a treaty made for the Devil; complaining that the King his master was treated as if he were a king of plaster, or like a German! “But the Lord’s hand,” he added from Scripture, “is not shortened!” It is easy to perceive that the Prime Minister had not yet wholly discarded the coarse buffooneries which had first fascinated Vendôme, and that his

\* Antonio Perez used to say, “Francia y España las Balanzas de Europa, Ynglaterra el Fiel.” (Relaciones, Append. p. 25. ed. 1624.)

† Un *hirco-cerf*! (St. Simon, Mém. vol. xvi. p. 180. ed. 1829.) Comme un Roi de plâtre! (Ibid.) Traiter un Roi d’Espagne à l’Allemande! (P. 236.) La main de Dieu n’est pas raccourcie! (vol. xv. p. 106.) The Treaty of Utrecht a treaty made for the Devil! (Alberoni’s Apology, Hist. Regist. 1722, p. 209.)



style had not risen with his station. He was above all indignant at the naval preparations in England, but only the more actively pursued his own. The Spanish armament comprised twenty-nine ships of war\*, with transports for 35,000 veteran soldiers, 100 pieces of battering cannon, 40 mortars, and a vast supply of provisions, stores, and ammunition of all kinds. Never, says a Spanish historian by no means favourable to Alberoni — never had an expedition so formidable been sent forth by any former sovereign of Spain, not even by the Emperor Charles or by Philip the Second.† The fleet was intrusted to Don Antonio Castañeta, a shipbuilder rather than a sailor in his original profession, and the troops were commanded by the Marquis de Lede, a Fleming in the Spanish service, of misshapen stature, but of great military experience. The first place of equipment for the expedition was Cadiz, and its precise destination entirely unknown. Except the ex-Jesuit Patiño, the Cardinal had not a single confidant to his schemes, and is perhaps the only instance in history of a very vain man (for such, undoubtedly, was Alberoni) who never once betrayed his secrets.

On receiving information of this mighty armament, Stanhope and Sunderland did not hesitate to give Byng their last instructions; and the Admiral sailed for the Mediterranean on the 4th of June with twenty ships of the line. The news from Spain had also no small effect at Vienna in lowering the pretensions of the Emperor. Our agent at that Court was then General de St. Saphorin, a Swiss of the canton de Berne, who had lately

\* See the enumeration of these ships in Campbell's *Lives of the Admirals*, vol. iv. p. 437. This is as the fleet was off the Faro. San Phelipe reckons twenty-two ships of the line, and three merchant vessels, *armados en guerra*; but this was on leaving the Spanish ports, and the others may have joined on the voyage.

† Nunca se vieron en España preparativos tan grandes; ni Ferdinando el Catolico que tantas expediciones ultramarinas hizo, ni Carlos V. ni Felipe II. que hizieron muchas han formado una mas adornada de circunstancias y de preparativos. (San Phelipe, vol. ii. p. 167.) The French ambassador says that Alberoni had an eye to every thing himself. "Il entre dans tous les détails, et paie jusqu'aux 'souliers des nourrices!'" Mém. de Louville, vol. ii. p. 220.

been taken into the English diplomatic service.\* He had found at first the Emperor's Ministers, especially Staremberg, deaf to all his overtures; but the greatness of the Spanish expedition, and, still more, the news of its having proceeded from Cadiz to Barcelona, wrought such changes, that St. Saphorin was able to announce their acceptance of the terms proposed to them. They also consented to the mediation of England for a peace between the Emperor and the Turks, which was, accordingly, signed this summer, and which left a considerable Austrian force disposable for Italy. Under these circumstances, Stanhope immediately concerted his measures with Dubois, who was still in London†, to frame the articles for a new treaty between England, France, and the Emperor. There still remained to subdue some hesitation in the mind of the Regent, and great reluctance on the part of his principal Ministers; and Stanhope, anxious to overcome all obstacles at this crisis, undertook a journey to Paris and held several conferences with Philip. The Marshal d'Huxelles, chief of the Council for Foreign Affairs, not only opposed the project with the greatest warmth, but absolutely refused to sign an alliance levelled against a grandson of Louis the Fourteenth. Nevertheless, Stanhope and Stair prevailed. The treaty was concluded early in July, though not finally signed till August; and, from the subsequent accession of the Dutch, received the name of THE QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE. The basis of this celebrated treaty was declared to be the

\* St. Simon speaks of this gentleman as "fort décrié depuis long-temps par plusieurs actions contre l'honneur et la probité, et par ses mauèges encore et ses déclamations contre la France." (Mém. vol. xv. p. 193. ed. 1829.) On the other hand, I find in the Biogr. Univ. (art. Pesmes), "A ses talents militaires et diplomatiques il joignait le jugement le plus sain, l'esprit le plus persévérant, et le cœur le plus droit!" I have no materials for deciding which of these statements is a lie.

† Dubois remained in England for the formal signature, and did not return to Paris till August. (Hist. of Europe, 1718, vol. ii. p. 197.) The Duke de St. Simon describes him as having played a merely passive part. "Stanhope régla tous les articles du traité. . . . L'Abbé Dubois avait déclaré qu'il ferait tout ce que voudrait le Roi d'Angleterre," &c. (Mém., vol. xvi. p. 285. and 299.) But it is to be observed that St. Simon had a personal animosity against Dubois, and strives on every occasion to depreciate his exertions.

Peace of Utrecht, and its object the preservation of tranquillity in Europe. It provided, according to the intentions I have already explained, for the mutual renunciations of the King of Spain and the Emperor, for the reversion of Parma and Tuscany to the Infant Don Carlos, and for the exchange of Sicily and Sardinia between Victor Amadeus and Charles. As a compensation for the unequal value of the two islands, the Emperor acknowledged the claims of the House of Savoy to the succession of Spain in case of the failure of Philip's issue. In twelve separate and secret articles it was stipulated, that the term of three months should be allowed for the accession of Philip and of Victor Amadeus, in default of which the whole force of the contracting parties was to be employed against both or either, and compel them to submit.

In hopes, however, of still averting an appeal to arms, Stanhope determined to proceed in person to Madrid, with the secret articles, and to make every exertion to subdue the stubbornness of Alberoni. He relied very much for success on an offer of yielding Gibraltar, in case all other means should fail; an idea, of course, kept profoundly secret, and, in my opinion, quite inconsistent with our national interests, or national glory.\* He also relied on some strong instructions from the Regent to M. de Naneré, which he was to carry out with him to Madrid, and which, according to St. Simon, had been dictated by Stanhope himself.† With these prospects he set out from Paris, attended by Mr. Schaub (afterwards Sir Luke), a Swiss in the British service, and his confidential secretary.

At that time the departure of the Spanish armament was already known, and its destination suspected in France.‡ It had sailed from Barcelona with sealed orders,

\* The blame of this idea of giving up Gibraltar rests mainly with Stanhope; he had suggested it from Paris to his colleagues in England, and obtained their acquiescence. (Secretary Craggs to Earl Stanhope, July 17. 1718. See Appendix, vol. ii.) In another letter of Craggs to Stanhope, of Sept. 16. 1720 (Hardwicke Papers, vol. lvii.), he alludes to "the opinion you have that Gibraltar is of no great consequence."

† *Mém.* vol. xvi. p. 332. ed. 1829.

‡ "Le 1<sup>r</sup> de ce mois, moi Lord Stanhope ai vu M. le Régent,

which the Admiral was not to open till out at sea, and which were found to contain an injunction to steer to Cagliari, and there to open another sealed parcel enclosed. At Cagliari the real object of the expedition was at length revealed, the Admiral being directed to land the troops in Sicily, and the General to make himself master of that island. Accordingly the fleet pursued its voyage, and on the 1st of July the army was set on shore at the beautiful bay of Solanto \*, four leagues distant from Palermo. That capital was unprepared for defence; many of the chief men friendly to their former Spanish rulers, or connected in blood with them, and the multitude, as usual, thinking their present grievances the worst, and looking back to the past as to the "good old times." The Marquis Maffei, the Piedmontese Viceroy, after providing for the garrison of the castle, had only at his disposal about fifteen hundred soldiers. He made a precipitate retreat, and the Spaniards a triumphal entrance; the citadel surrendered to them after a short blockade, and they confidently expected the speedy and complete reduction of the island.

The motive of Alberoni in directing his arms to this quarter had been principally to avert the threatened interposition of France and England. Both powers were pledged to the neutrality of Italy, and one also to the guarantee of the Emperor's dominions; but neither of them had contracted any such obligation with regard to Sicily, or to the states of Victor Amadeus. Alberoni might therefore not unreasonably hope that they would hesitate before they plunged into a war, where they had no direct pledge to redeem, and no immediate interest to defend. He might hope, at all events, for some months of delay and negotiation, during which he trusted that his intrigues might have matured — that a domestic conspiracy might be bursting forth in France — that a

"... Il avait appris de très-bonne part que la flotte d'Espagne devait aller en Sicile, que l'idée du Cardinal est de s'emparer de cette île et que pendant l'hiver il croit pouvoir bailler assez de besogne au Roi en Angleterre et à M. le Duc d'Orléans en France." — Lord Stanhope and Lord Stair (joint letter) to Secretary Craggs, July 6. 1718. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxv.

\* Solanto is close under Cape Zafarana. I remember seeing there a palace and "tonnara," or tunny fishery, of the late King of Naples.

Swedish or Russian army might be landing in Great Britain — and that he might then, without molestation, pursue his further designs on Naples and the Milanese. Nor was he withheld by the state of his negotiation with Victor Amadeus ; that negotiation had indeed proceeded to considerable lengths ; but had finally failed, the King of Sicily demanding subsidies which the King of Spain was not inclined to grant. The invasion was still further recommended by the large number of Spanish adherents, and the small number of Piedmontese troops, in that island.

Flushed with the tidings of the first success in Sicily, Alberoni became less tractable than ever. The first news of the Quadruple Alliance, or rather the very idea of its possibility, excited his fury. " Could I believe," he cried, " that such a treaty was really signed, Nancré should not remain a quarter of an hour longer in Madrid . . . . The King my master will wage eternal war rather than consent to this infamous project, and he will wreak his vengeance on those who presume to threaten him with it. If Stanhope comes here thinking to lay down the law, he will find himself ill received. I have sent him a passport as he requested, and I will hear the proposals he brings, but it will be impossible to give them the slightest attention unless they totally differ from the project." \*

Nor was the Cardinal daunted by the close approach and avowed object of the British expedition. On arriving off Cape St. Vincent, Admiral Byng had despatched a messenger with the tidings and with a copy of his instructions to Colonel Stanhope, requesting him to communicate both to the Spanish Government. In an interview which the British envoy consequently had with Alberoni, he found all his remonstrances met only with a burst of vehement invective against France and England ; and when he presented a list of the British ships, the Cardinal furiously snatched it, tore it to pieces, and trampled it under his feet. At the close of the conversation, however, he promised to take the King's commands, and to send an answer in writing ; but this answer, which

\* St. Simon, *Mém.* vol. xvi. p. 343, and 349. ed. 1829.



was delayed for several days, brought merely a dry intimation that Admiral Byng might execute the orders of the King his master.

In this temper of the Spanish Government the arrival of Lord Stanhope at Madrid, on the 12th of August (he had been delayed by their remissness in forwarding his passport), could produce little effect. Finding that the Court had gone to the Escorial, he hastened thither, obtained the co-operation of the Marquis de Nancré, and had several conferences both with the King and with the Cardinal; but neither the Royal puppet, nor the Minister who pulled the strings, gave him any but very slight hopes of acceding to his propositions. Even these slight hopes were dispelled by the news of the reduction of Messina. "I showed my Lord Stanhope," says the Cardinal himself, "that as long as the Archduke (the Emperor) is master of Sicily, all Italy will be the slave of the Germans, and all the powers of Europe not able to set her at liberty. I also represented to him very clearly that to make war in Lombardy was to make it in a labyrinth, and that it was the destructive burial-place of the French and English. In conclusion, I told him that the proposition of giving Sicily to the Archduke was absolutely fatal, and that of setting bounds afterwards to his vast designs a mere dream and illusion. This is the substance of all the conferences had by my Lord Stanhope."\* — From Stanhope's despatches†, however, it appears that Alberoni continued pacific professions to the last, and endeavoured to shift the blame from himself to his master. He declared that he wished for no conquests in Italy, and knew that Spain would be far more powerful by confining itself to its continent and to its Indies, and improving its internal administration, than by spreading itself abroad in Europe as before. At parting with Stanhope he even shed tears, and promised to let slip no occasion that might offer of adjusting matters; and, more than once, he bitterly complained of the

\* Cardinal Alberoni to Marquis Beretti Landi, Aug. 29. 1718. Boyer's Political State, 1718, vol. ii. p. 222.

† Stanhope's despatches from Fresnada near the Escorial, and from Bayonne on his return, are inserted in the Appendix to my second volume, and give a very curious view of Alberoni's character and policy.

King of Spain's obstinacy and personal resentment against the Emperor and the Duke of Orleans. Yet, on the other hand, he could not altogether conceal his hopes of raising disturbances in France and England; he evidently felt no small share of the animosity which he ascribed solely to his master; and he seems to have fluctuated from hot to cold fits, according as the mail from Sicily brought him favourable or unfavourable news.

With respect to Gibraltar, that affair was so secretly conducted, that it cannot be accurately traced. Whether, as some believe, there were other conditions (especially a large demand of territory in America) annexed to the offer\*, and that Alberoni would not comply with them, or whether Gibraltar itself appeared to him an inadequate reward for the relinquishment of his ambitious schemes, certain it is that the proposal did not move him from his purpose, and that the English Minister found it necessary to return homewards without succeeding in the object of his journey.

But whatever resentment Stanhope might feel at the stubbornness of Alberoni, he did not fail to observe, nor hesitate to own, the eminent talents of that Minister. He who had seen Spain in the evil days of her Charles the Second, when a decrepit sovereign feebly tottered on her sinking throne — when her agriculture, her trade, and her respect among nations were all but annihilated — when famine stalked through her palaces† — when her officers, chosen by Court favour, brought back nothing from their campaigns but ignorance and promotion — when her soldiers, once the terror of Europe and the scourge of America, were reduced for want of pay to beg in the streets, or to wait at the convent doors for their daily dole of food‡; — he who had seen Spain during the

\* "There is reason to believe that the offer of Gibraltar was "coupled with some condition besides the immediate succession of "Spain to the peace." (Coxe's House of Bourbon, vol. ii. p. 329.) It may be observed that Gibraltar was about this period a source of profuse and ill-regulated expense. Lord Bolingbroke in a despatch to Lord Portmore of March 29. 1712, complains that "at Gibraltar "things have hitherto been in the utmost confusion and under the "loosest management."

† *Lettres de Villars*, p. 220.

‡ See Labat's Travels, vol. i. p. 252. This was no new case: the

War of the Succession, torn and bleeding with internal strife, city against city, and kingdom against kingdom — he could scarcely have believed that in the course of a few short years he should see the same country send forth an Armada of nearly thirty line-of-battle ships, and of more than thirty thousand well appointed, well paid, and well disciplined troops — that this fleet should be built in the long disused and forsaken harbours of Catalonia and Biscay — that this army should be clothed from new native manufactories — that weavers from England and dyers from Holland should import their industry and ply their trade in Castille — that a great naval college should be established and flourishing at Cadiz — that new citadels should be built at Barcelona and Pamplona, and the old fortifications repaired at Rosas, Gerona, Fuenterabia, and St. Sebastian. Already had workmen begun to construct a new and extensive port at Ferrol — already had a Dutch engineer undertaken to render the river Manzanares navigable, and the capital of Spain open to water-carriage.\* America, which, in the words of Alberoni, “had become Terra Incognita even to Spain,” again appeared an Eldorado; and a FLOTA arriving from it during Lord Stanhope’s embassy,

Duke of York told Pepys how the Spanish soldiers “will refuse no “extraordinary service if commanded; but scorn to be paid for it as “in other countries, though at the same time they will beg in the “streets. . . . . In the citadel of Antwerp a soldier hath not a “liberty of begging till he hath served three years.” (Pepys’s Diary, December 20. 1668.)

\* A similar project, to connect Madrid and Lisbon by water-carriage, had been formed under Charles the Second; but the Council of Castille, after full deliberation, answered that if God had chosen to make these rivers navigable, he could have done so without the aid of man, and that therefore such a project would be a daring violation of the divine decrees, and an impious attempt to improve the works of Providence! (Letters by the Rev. E. Clarke, 1763, p. 284.) The smallness of the Manzanares, which is almost dry in summer, has been a frequent subject of jest among the Spaniards themselves. That quaint old poet Gongora, however, allows it the rank of Viscount among rivers: —

“ Manzanares, Manzanares,  
 “ Os que en todo el aguatismo,  
 “ Sois el Duque de Arroyos,  
 “ Y Vizconde de los Rios!”

had on board no less than six millions and a half in gold and silver!\* Nor had Alberoni been wholly engrossed with what is useful; objects of taste and elegance had also a part of his care. A traveller at this time might have seen a stately palace arising in the romantic wilds of Guadarrama†, and new ornaments embellish the delicious island-garden of Aranjuez.‡ Struck with these great works, and greater designs, Stanhope publicly observed, "If Spain goes on at this rate, and has the same "success in the other establishments she has in view, "there is no power will be able to resist her!"§ The Spaniards on their part, roused by their own successes, might be pardoned for assuming a prouder tone, and displaying their high national spirit; they might speak more slightly than ever of all foreign nations, and forget at the moment that they had a Frenchman for their King, an Italian for their Minister, and a Fleming for their General!

From negotiations at Madrid, let us now turn to warfare in Sicily. The Piedmontese had become most unpopular in the island; many towns and districts rose in insurrection against them; and in one, Caltanissetta||, forty of their soldiers were butchered by the savage peasantry. The only places that could offer any resistance were Syracuse, Trapani, Melazzo, and Messina; in the first of which Maffei, the Viceroy, had taken refuge;

\* Boyer's Polit. State, 1718, vol. ii. p. 167.

† The palace of San Ildefonso, begun during Alberoni's administration, was completed in 1723. (San Phelipe, Coment. vol. ii. p. 303.)

‡ These gardens seem familiar to us, from Mr. Southey's beautiful description. (Penins. War. vol. iv. p. 60.) They have been embellished by almost every successive sovereign of Spain, since Charles V. Even in the sixteenth century the place was proverbial for its fountains, and the name is humorously applied by Cervantes to issues in the leg! (Don Quixote, part 2. ch. 50. vol. vii. p. 28. ed. Paris, 1814.)

§ This is a testimony to which Alberoni referred with pride after his fall. See his Apology, Hist. Register, 1722, p. 208.

|| This is, I presume, the *Cantanieta* of San Phelipe. The Spanish writers are often careless as to names. One of their strangest blunders relates to Syracuse, which, from a resemblance of sounds, they sometimes confound with the capital of Aragon, and call *Zaragoza de Sicilia*.

but it was against the latter that De Lede directed his arms, leaving only a small detachment to the westward for the blockade of Trapani. To march along the Sicilian coast is by no means an easy task, from the great number of FIUMARAS, which have never any bridges to cross them\*, and which, according to the season, display either swollen and impetuous torrents, or dry and rugged beds of huge stones. The Spanish infantry was, accordingly, transported to Messina by sea; while only the cavalry proceeded along the shore, its vanguard commanded by the Marquis de Villadarias, the old and gallant adversary of the English in the Bay of Cadiz, and on the field of Almenara.

The city of Messina gladly opened its gates to the invaders; but the citadel, which had a garrison of 2500 Piedmontese, required a regular siege; and trenches were opened against it on the 31st of July. Its safety was an object of the deepest solicitude to the Austrians in the kingdom of Naples, foreseeing that they themselves would infallibly be the next object of attack. Their Viceroy, Count Daun, was a brave and skilful officer; but the troops under his orders were few†; and it is certain that, had he been left only to his German soldiers (the Neapolitan are scarcely worth reckoning), he would, so far from assisting Maffei, have speedily shared his fate.

But the mighty arm of England was already outstretched for his succour. On the very day after the investment of Messina, the fleet of Sir George Byng anchored in the Bay of Naples. The possibility of an attack upon Sicily had not been overlooked in the Admiral's instructions; he was directed, in that case, "with all his power to hinder and obstruct the same;" and he, therefore, immediately landed, to concert measures with Count Daun. He was informed that the last letters from Vienna gave

\* There is a proverbial saying in Sicily, that the island contains only *un monte, un fonte, e un ponte*; meaning Etna, Arethusa, and a bridge over the Salso near Alicata. (Capt. Smyth's Sicily, p. 199.)

† According to St. Simon there were only 6000 foot and 1500 horse in the kingdom. (Mém. vol. xvi. p. 279. ed. 1829.) Tindal speaks of eight or twelve thousand. (Hist. vol. vii. p. 214.) Considering how long a Spanish invasion of Naples had been expected by the Emperor, even the highest of these numbers appears incredibly small.



hopes of the King of Sicily's speedy accession to the Quadruple Alliance, His Majesty having already requested the aid of the Imperial troops, and consented to admit them into the Sicilian fortresses. Under these circumstances, it was resolved that Daun should despatch, and Byng convoy, a detachment of 2000 German infantry to the garrison of Messina. These men being embarked in TARTANAS, the Admiral bore away for the straits of the Faro; but still hoping to prevent hostilities, he sent his first Captain to the Marquis de Lede with a conciliatory letter, proposing a suspension of arms for two months. This overture being civilly declined, he put the Germans, for safety, into Reggio, and sailed through the Faro in search of the Spanish fleet.

The Spanish Admirals, meanwhile, were benumbed by that indecision which, in military matters, is perhaps still more pernicious than error. Castañeta does not appear to have been guided by any positive orders from his Government; but was directed, in all difficulties, to apply to Patiño, the INTENDENTE, as he was called, of the whole expedition, who, having been eighteen years a Jesuit, may be presumed to have had somewhat less of naval than of religious or political knowledge. From fear of responsibility, or ignorance of details, Patiño gave only a very vague answer, amounting to little more than that the Spanish fleet should provide for its safety. A council of officers, convened thereupon, and comprising, besides Castañeta, the Rear-Admirals Mari, Chacon, and Cammock, could scarcely be said to deliberate; it only wavered. Much loose conversation passed; no useful resolution was taken. The only sensible scheme was that of Cammock, an Irishman in the Pretender's interest and the Spaniards' service, who proposed that they should remain at anchor in the road of Messina, ranging their ships in line of battle, with their broadsides to the sea, by which means they might not only have been supported by the batteries and troops on shore, but, from the variety and force of the currents, would have rendered a regular attack upon them extremely difficult, if not impracticable.\*

\* The station of the Spanish fleet was at a beautiful bay called *Il Paradiso*, about two miles north of Messina. About a century after the action, it was viewed by a very experienced and intelligent

This proposal being over-ruled, the Admirals put out to sea, without any fixed determination either to fight or to retreat; but continued lingering and hovering, first off Cape Spartivento, and then off Cape Passaro, until in the morning of the 11th of August they saw Byng and his squadron close upon them. The British fleet was superior in force as well as in discipline; for, though the Spaniards had most ships, several of these were only brigs or armed merchantmen, whilst none of the British vessels carried less than fifty guns.\* On the approach of the English, Mari and six men-of-war, which were separated from the main fleet of the Spaniards, drew nearer to the Sicilian coast; and Byng despatched a division, under Captain Walton, to intercept them. There seems little doubt that the English Admiral would not have shrunk from the responsibility of the first attack; but the firing, in fact, was begun by Mari's ships, and, being returned by the English, there ensued a general engagement.† A slight breeze, which sprung up, carried the English fleet into the very midst of the Spanish, and mingled the ships of both nations together. The Spaniards, without order and concert, and vessel after vessel attacked in succession by a superior force, found even the highest courage, the most stubborn resistance, unavailing. Castañeta himself, as bold in action as irresolute in council, endeavoured to cheer his seamen by the most determined bravery; and even when wounded in both legs,

"naval officer (Capt. Smyth), who observes, that had the fleet remained at anchor there (as Cammock proposed), it would have been "very difficult to annoy it." (Sicily and its Islands, p. 112.) Among the Stuart Papers I have found "His Majesty's private instructions to "Admiral George Cammock."

\* The total number of guns in the English fleet was 1400, in the Spanish 1284; and two vessels included in the latter list were not in the action, having been sent to Malta under Admiral Guevara. (Campbell's Lives of the Admirals, vol. iv. p. 427. and 438.)

† That the Spaniards began the action is always urged in the English State Papers of this period, and is distinctly admitted by San Phelipe (Coment. vol. ii. p. 195.). The Spanish historian is somewhat testy at this battle. He observes, that the English are superior seamen to the Spaniards, because they study nothing else (*porque estos no tienen otro oficio*), but that the Spanish courage is far higher (*imponderable valor, mas que los Ingleses!*) (p. 191. and 195.)

this Spanish Widdrington still continued to fight upon his stumps. But both his efforts and his example were in vain. Even had the English been fewer, I may be pardoned for believing that they would still have been victorious. Castañeta was made prisoner, and the greater part of his fleet either taken or destroyed. Admiral Cammock alone, with ten ships of war, forced his way from the battle, and found shelter in the port of La Valletta. In an opposite direction Mari had also made his escape with some ships of the line; but Captain Walton, being sent in pursuit, compelled them to surrender. Walton's report, on this occasion, is remarkable for simplicity, the usual attendant and the surest recommendation of merit. It was merely, "Sir, we have taken and destroyed "all the Spanish ships which were upon the coast: the "number as per margin." A naval writer well observes, that the ships which Captain Walton thrust into his margin would have furnished matter for some pages in a French relation.\*

The loss of the English in the action of Passaro was not considerable; only one ship, the *Grafton*, suffered severely. To have thus annihilated the Spanish armada might be thought something more than merely a declaration of war; yet Byng affected not to consider it as such, and sent a complimentary letter to De Lede, urging that the Spaniards had begun the battle, and that they ought not to look upon this accident as a rupture between the two nations. This compliment, it may well be supposed, was very coldly received by men still smarting under the loss and shame of their defeat. Nor did it deaden their zeal for the reduction of Messina; on the contrary, they pushed their attacks with so much vigour, that, in spite of the efforts of the Austrian troops at Reggio, and the activity of the British fleet in the straits, the place surrendered at the close of September; and Byng thereupon sailed back with his squadron to Naples.

The conduct of the English Admiral in fighting the Spanish fleet was entirely approved by the English Ministry. It is remarkable that Stanhope, who had left

\* Campbell's Admirals, vol. iv. p. 428.

Spain before any news of the action had arrived\*, writes to Byng from Bayonne on the 2d of September, recommending the very course which the Admiral had already taken: "Nothing has passed at Madrid which should divert you from pursuing the instructions you have. . . . If you should have an opportunity of attacking the Spanish fleet, I am persuaded you will not let such an occasion slip; and I agree perfectly in opinion with what is recommended to you by Mr. Secretary Craggs, that the first blow you give should, if possible, be decisive. The two great objects which I think we ought to have in view are, to destroy their fleet if possible, and to preserve such a footing in Sicily as may enable us to land an army there." The manner in which the Admiral had anticipated these directions was much praised; even the Spaniards acknowledged his high personal merit; and, on his return from his command, this brave and skilful officer was deservedly raised to the rank of Viscount Torrington.

The high-flown hopes which Alberoni had cherished of the Spanish armament may give us some idea of his burst of rage at its defeat. He wrote to the Marquis de Monteleon in most vehement terms, loudly complaining of breach of faith, and commanding that Minister to depart immediately from England. His letter and the ambassador's to Mr. Craggs, were also, by his direction, made public in London, with the view of raising a national ferment against the Ministry. But the indignation of Alberoni was not confined to words; he gave orders, in direct violation of the Treaty of Commerce, to seize the British goods and vessels in the Spanish ports, and to dismiss the British Consuls from the Spanish territory. Numerous privateers also were fitted out and sent forth

\* Coxe conjectures that "before Earl Stanhope quitted the capital, some intelligence of the discomfiture of the fleet probably reached 'Alberoni.'" (House of Bourbon, vol. ii. p. 330.) But this is certainly an error. The action was fought on the 11th, Lord Stanhope set out on the 26th; and on examining the dates at which other tidings of the Sicilian army reached Madrid, it will be found that they never came in so short a time. Nor could a vessel be speedily despatched from a fleet just defeated and dispersed. Moreover Coxe's supposition is not readily to be reconciled with Alberoni's burst of indignation at the first public announcement of the battle.

against the British traders. Yet it is remarkable that, in spite of these mutual injuries, the breach was not yet considered complete and decisive, and that a declaration of war from England was still withheld.

We are also assured that an edict was published at Madrid by beat of drum, prohibiting all persons from speaking of the disaster of the fleet; an order which, as it seems suited only for the meridian of Tunis or Algiers, I should have thought utterly incredible in Spain, were it not recorded by most unimpeachable authority.\*

Alberoni himself, irritated and not dismayed by his reverses, haughtily persevered in his domestic preparations and foreign cabals; and I shall now proceed to relate the issue of his manifold schemes in Holland, Piedmont, Sweden, France, and England.

The commercial jealousy of the Dutch, and their natural slowness, were turned to the best advantage by the Marquis Beretti Landi, the Spanish ambassador. He had, however, an able antagonist in the Minister from England, Earl Cadogan, whose great influence with the States rested not merely on his talents and services, but also on his known intimacy with the Duke of Marlborough, and on his marriage with a Dutch lady of powerful connections. Neither of these distinguished rivals altogether prevailed. Cadogan, indeed, obtained the accession of Holland to the Quadruple Alliance; but Landi delayed it for several months, and until the cause of Spain had been struck by further disasters.

At the Court of Turin there was no such opportunity for hesitation; the difficulties of Victor Amadeus were pressing and immediate. He found his kingdom of Sicily at the same time claimed by Charles and attacked by Philip. No succour, no hope appeared for him in any quarter; on the one side stood the Quadruple Allies, presenting the treaty and demanding his signature, and on the other side there gleamed 30,000 Spanish bayonets against him. Even after the expedition to Sicily, Alberoni had not altogether lost his hope of cajoling Victor

\* "On publie au son du tambour une défense de parler du désastre de la flotte." (Duc de St. Aignan to the Regent, Sept. 17. 1718. *Mém. de Noailles*, vol. v. p. 96.)



Amadeus: he represented the conquest of the island as only a precautionary measure to prevent its transfer from its rightful owner, and expressed an ardent zeal for the preservation of the Peace of Utrecht. But the artifice was too gross, and easily seen through.\* The King of Sicily determined, that if he must lose his island, he would at least incline to that power which offered a positive, though insufficient, compensation for it; he therefore broke off all intercourse with Spain, acceded to the Quadruple Alliance, and consented to give over to Imperial troops the remaining fortresses of Syracuse, Melazzo, and Trapani. His Regal title of Sicily was soon after exchanged for that of Sardinia, still held by his descendants; and this was perhaps the only negotiation which the House of Savoy had ever yet carried on without extracting from it some advantage.

In Sweden and Russia, the schemes of Alberoni seemed at first more hopeful; and, according to his own expression, there was reason to expect that the northern clouds would break in thunder and hail-storms.† A negotiation between Charles the Twelfth and the Czar had been opened in the Isle of Aland, under the mediation of a Swedish agent; and the Duke of Ormond had hastened to Russia as plenipotentiary of the Pretender.‡ It was agreed that Peter should retain Livonia, Ingria, and other Swedish territories to the southward of Finland; that Charles should undertake the conquest of Norway and the recovery of Bremen and Verden; and that both monarchs should combine for the restoration of Stanislaus in Poland, and of the Stuarts in Great Britain. The latter point was foremost in the wishes of Gortz, who had planned and forwarded the whole design — who enjoyed more than ever the confidence of his master — and who had left his Dutch captivity, stung with disappointment at his failure, and burning with revenge against King

\* “Esta carta (del Cardinal) en la realidad era absolutamente “inutil, y no debiera haber Alberoni perdido tiempo en ella.” (Ortiz Compendio, vol. vii. p. 336.)

† St. Simon, vol. xv. p. 308. ed. 1829.

‡ Amongst the Stuart Papers is the original passport given to Ormond in Russian and Latin, and signed by Peter the Great. Ormond travelled under the name of Brunet.

George and King George's Ministers. So active and embittered an enemy was the very man to raise and direct the tempest against England. The tempest was raised; but it burst upon his own head. Charles, pursuing his plans and impatient of delay, led an army into Norway, notwithstanding the severity of winter; and on the 11th of December, with the snow and ice deep around him, he was pressing the siege of the frontier fortress of Frederikshall, when a musket-ball from an unknown hand laid him lifeless on the frozen ground. He had begun to reign and (what in him was synonymous) to fight in his eighteenth year; he died in his thirty-sixth; and, during that period, he had been the tyrant and scourge of that nation by whom his memory is now adored! Such is the halo with which glory is invested by posterity! But very different was the feeling at the time of Charles's fall; and a total change of system was so universally demanded as to be easily effected. His sister Ulrica was proclaimed his successor by the Senate; but the form of the monarchy was altered from the most despotic to the most limited in Europe. All his Ministers were dismissed, all his projects abandoned: his chief favourite, Gortz, gratified the public resentment by an ignominious death upon the scaffold; and the intended league, which had threatened the throne of England, vanished as speedily and utterly as one of those thunder-clouds to which Alberoni had compared it.

I have already had occasion to notice the projects of Alberoni in France, and the party with which he was connected in that country. Its head was nominally the Duke, but in truth the Duchess du Maine; the former being of a timorous and feeble mind, and the latter abounding in courage and in cabals. She was granddaughter to the famous Condé, and was assured by all her dependants, especially her husband, that she inherited the spirit of that great man, although in truth her character had more of passion than prudence, and more of prudence than dexterity. A single fact from her domestic life will give an idea of her violence; she could not bear the least suspense of hunger, or restraint of regular meals, and had always in her apartment a table with cold meats, of which she partook at any instant that

the fancy struck her. This bold virago had opened a secret concert of measures with the Prince of Cellamare, the Spanish ambassador, and used to drive to nightly conferences at his house in a borrowed carriage, with Count Laval acting as coachman. It does not appear that any great number of persons were fully initiated into their schemes\*; but it is certain, that though the conspirators were few the malcontents were many. The conclusion of the Quadruple Alliance had provoked great murmurs, there being opposed to it the judgment of the most able statesmen, and, what is far more formidable, the prejudices of the multitude. Marshal d'Huxelles had repeatedly refused to sign that treaty, and only yielded, at length, to the positive commands of the Regent; Marshal Villars presented a strong memorial against what he termed the unnatural alliance of France with England; and, in one word, all the adherents of the old Court loudly inveighed against the altered system of the new. Even the wife of the Regent, a sister of the Duke du Maine, was more mindful of her ties by blood than by marriage. The States of Brittany complained of provincial oppression, the Jesuits sighed for a return, and the Parliament of Paris for an augmentation of power; and all with one voice reprobated, as they most justly might, the personal profligacy and boundless influence of Dubois. Nothing could be more various than the views of all these parties and persons, some eager to destroy, others only to restore or to improve; but the skill of Alberoni knew how to combine them for one common movement; and it is precisely by such junctions of dissembling knaves and honest dupes that nearly all revolutions are effected. The project was to seize the Duke of Orleans in one of his parties of pleasure near Paris, to convoke the States-General, to proclaim the King of Spain, as next in blood, the rightful Regent, and the

\* "Messrs. de Laval et de Pompadour avancaient comme certain "tout ce qui leur passait par la tete, promettant l'entremise et l'appui "de quantité de gens entierement ignorans de leurs desseins, que sur "de vaines conjectures ils jugeaient propres à y entrer." (Mém. de Madame de Staal, vol. ii. p. 6.) She was then Mademoiselle de Launay; first a maid and afterwards a companion and confidant of the Duchess du Maine. Her reflections are shrewd and sarcastic.

Duke du Maine his deputy. Already had the eloquent pen of Cardinal Polignac been employed in appropriate addresses, which were kept in readiness, to the King, to the States, and to the Parliaments; and already had armed bands, under the semblance of FAUX SAUNTERS, or salt smugglers, been directed to gather on the Somme.

The first intelligence to the Regent that some such plot was brewing came from the Cabinet of St. James's, and a warning was also given by the French embassy at Madrid. The Government, however, judiciously refrained from showing any symptom of alarm; thus lulling the conspirators into such security and remissness, as to neglect the use of cipher and other precautions for secrecy. It only remained for Cellamare to transmit to Madrid an account of his proceedings, with copies of the manifestoes already mentioned, and to take the last orders of Alberoni upon the subject. There was then at Paris a young Spanish abbé, Don Vicente Portocarrero, a kinsman of the celebrated Cardinal; and it was he whom Cellamare determined, at the beginning of December, to send with these important papers, thinking that his youth would be a security against suspicion, and his rank against arrest; and for similar reasons he adjoined to him a son of the Marquis de Monteleon. But these things had not escaped the watchful eye of Dubois. How they came to his knowledge is doubtful; on this point St. Simon professes ignorance, and Voltaire shows it.\* Be this as it may, Dubois gave orders to pursue the travellers, and Portocarrero was overtaken at Poitiers, himself arrested, and his papers seized. These papers, forwarded

\* "Une entremetteuse distinguée fournissait des filles à ce jeune homme. Elle avait longtemps servi l'Abbé Dubois, alors Secrétaire d'Etat. Elle fit agir une fille fort adroite qui vola des papiers importants, avec quelques billets de banque dans les poches de l'Abbé Portocarrero. . . . L'Abbé ayant vu ses papiers disparaître, et ne retrouvant plus la fille, partit sur le champ pour l'Espagne; on courut après lui," &c. (Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XV.*) This story, however, is certainly false, at least in its details, it being quite evident from the original documents that Portocarrero had no suspicion of discovery or pursuit until he reached Poitiers. A similar anecdote, perhaps with more foundation, is told by Madame de Staël of the Secretary of Cellamare, but she does not name him. (*Mém.* vol. ii. p. 24.)

to Paris, were found to afford a clue to some discoveries, and a confirmation of others; and Dubois, making a great merit of his vigilance, and keeping the affair as much as possible in his own hands, laid them before the Regent. It was determined to adopt the same treatment towards Cellamare as, under precisely similar circumstances, Gyllenborg had received in London; and his person was accordingly put under arrest, and his papers examined; but the ambassador had already had time to conceal or destroy the most private.

To seize the persons of the Duke and Duchess du Maine seemed of still more importance, and perhaps of greater difficulty in case of popular ferment and tumult. The Regent determined that, immediately on their arrest, they should be conveyed from the neighbourhood of Paris; the Duke to Dourlens, in Picardy, and the Duchess to the castle of Dijon. Not the slightest resistance was experienced in the execution of these orders: the husband was arrested at Sceaux, the wife in the Rue St. Honoré, and they were removed to their several destinations, each with equal safety, but by no means with equal submission. During the journey, the Duke, pale and terror-stricken, was seen to mutter prayers and cross himself whenever he passed a church; but did not venture to ask many questions, or to make a single complaint; and, for fear of giving offence, did not even mention the Duchess or his children. The Duchess, on the contrary, having for many years at Sceaux amused herself with acting plays, assumed the deportment of a tragic heroine, poured forth torrents of furious reproaches, not the less sincere though often contradictory, and seemed to find great consolation and relief in reviling the officer who guarded her.\*

Besides the Duke and Duchess du Maine, Cardinal Polignac, M. de Pompadour, and several others, were either exiled or arrested; and the conspiracy was effectually crushed by the dispersion of its chiefs. Cellamare was escorted to the frontiers of Spain. A circular, addressed to the Foreign Ministers at Paris, explained the causes which had led to the strong but necessary measure

\* St. Simon, *Mém.* vol. xvii. p. 250. and 270. ed. 1829.



of seizing one of their number; and in confirmation of this statement, were also published two of the letters from Cellamare, which Portocarrero had been conveying.\*

Before the news of this disappointment reached Madrid a total rupture had already taken place between Alberoni and the Duke de St. Aignan, French ambassador.† The latter, disgusted at his fruitless remonstrances, and bound by positive instructions, had requested his audience of leave; but this, under various pretexts, was eluded by the Cardinal, who expected the speedy explosion of the conspiracy in France, and who wished, in the event of its failure, to retain the French ambassador as a hostage for Cellamare. Under these circumstances, St. Aignan set out from Madrid without notice, and Alberoni, much irritated, gave orders to have him pursued and arrested. But the Frenchman, knowing the person with whom he had to deal, and expecting some such order, left his carriage near Pamplona, with a servant to personate him, and crossed the mountains on a mule to St. Jean Pied du Port. The precaution was well timed, for the servant was arrested, and for some time detained as the ambassador. Meanwhile Alberoni, aware that this violent measure must lead to retaliation in France, wrote to Cellamare, directing him, in case he should be obliged to leave the country, "first to set fire to all the mines." But this letter arriving after Cellamare's detention, was intercepted by the French Government, and would have rendered it far more difficult for Alberoni, had he even wished it, to disavow his agent and his acts. The Cardinal, however, entertained no such intention. On the contrary, when he learnt the miscarriage of his hopeful schemes, he induced his Royal master to issue, on the 25th of December, a manifesto, avowing and justifying his measures, assailing the government of the Duke of Orleans, and appealing to the French nation against it.

\* See these letters in their original Italian in Boyer's Political State, 1718, vol. ii. p. 509—518.

† "Saint Aignan était trop jeune, trop timide, et surtout trop pauvre pour balancer un homme comme Alberoni. On ne doit pas attendre de vigilance utile d'un ambassadeur qui recourt aux expédients pour vivre; or ce seigneur était souvent réduit à engager son argenterie; ainsi qu'il l'avoue dans ses lettres au Marquis de Louville." (Mém. de Louville, vol. ii. p. 189.)

After such provocation it was impossible for the Regent any longer to withhold a declaration of war against Spain. The English Cabinet had for some time been urging him to this measure, and delaying its own, with a view to his accession. Both declarations were published at nearly the same time, the English on the 17th of December, Old Style, and the French on the 9th of January, New Style.

At this period the Parliament was sitting, it having met on the 11th of November. The addresses in answer to the King's speech, moved in the Upper House by Lord Carteret, and in the Lower by Lord Hinchinbroke, produced a warm debate on Spanish affairs. Lord Stanhope, in answer to Lord Strafford, gave an account of his late negotiations and journeys, stating that it was high time for Great Britain to check the growth of the naval power of Spain, in order to protect and secure the trade of British subjects, who had been violently oppressed by the Spaniards—that he thought it an honour to have been amongst those who advised Sir George Byng's instructions—and that he was ready to answer for them with his head. On a division the Lords' Address was carried by 83 against 50. In the Commons Walpole declared against the Quadruple Alliance with a vehemence which shortly afterwards proved a little embarrassing to him, when in scarcely more than a year he became a steady supporter of that very system. He observed that the late measures were contrary to the laws of nations, and a breach of solemn treaties, and that the giving sanction to them in the manner proposed could have no other view than to screen Ministers, who were conscious of having done something amiss, and who, having begun a war against Spain, would now make it the Parliament's war. Shippen and Wyndham supported Walpole, but Secretary Craggs replied to him with great spirit; and on putting the question, the Ministers had 216 votes, and the Opposition 155. Subsequently, on the King's declaration of war, there was in the Commons an equally vehement debate, but a still more decisive division. Nor does it appear that the war caused any dissatisfaction in the nation at large: on the contrary, the vast preparations of Spain had excited uneasiness, and their attacks on our

trade, indignation; the victory of Byng was highly celebrated, and the opposition of Walpole found but few supporters amongst the friends of the Hanover Succession. Besides, with the multitude there are two things which are almost always very popular at the beginning—the first is a war, and the second a peace.

The great measure of this Session was the Act for the relief of Protestant Dissenters. By the passing of the Bill against Occasional Conformity in 1711, and of the Schism Bill in 1714, they had been reduced to a state of great humiliation and depression, and they found the enmity of the Tories more steady than the friendship of the Whigs. Stanhope, however, had earnestly espoused their cause, and, ever since he came into power, had sought to frame and carry through some measure in their behalf. He wished to repeal not merely the Bill against Occasional Conformity and the Schism Bill, but also the Test Act, thus placing the Dissenters on the footing of perfect political equality. Nor were the views of Stanhope confined to Protestants; he had also formed the plan of repealing, or at least of very greatly mitigating, the penal laws in force against the Roman Catholics; and there will be found in the Appendix a paper which he wrote to be put into the hands of some leading men of that persuasion, containing some conditions with the Pope, and some clauses of an oath for themselves, as terms of the proposed indulgence. The first negotiations failed\*, and Stanhope's life was too short to carry that design any farther; nor do I think that he or any other

\* Craggs writes to Stanhope, June 30. 1719. "Dr. Strickland thought that the paper was digested in the properest form to be shown to the Roman Catholics, and, at his request and persuasion, I carried a copy of that paper, not signed, to a meeting where the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Waldegrave, and Mr. Charles Howard assisted. . . . I found the two noblemen inclinable to come into the proposal therein made." The negotiation was, however, broken off. Craggs says in another letter, of July 24., "I understand since, that these folks have been misled by the Prince's people, who have given them mighty assurances that they would destroy the present Ministry with the King, and so discouraged them from engaging themselves in a falling house. There is good reason to believe that this is all owing to Mr. Pulteney." These letters are in the Hardwicke Papers, vol. cxxv.

man, at that period, would have been able to effect it against the general tide of public feeling; but still the scheme seems not undeserving of attention, as the earliest germ of Roman Catholic Emancipation.

Several conferences passed between Stanhope and some of the principal of the Protestant Nonconformists, and they found Sunderland as friendly in his views, though not so sanguine in his hopes. He seems to have estimated more justly than Stanhope the formidable obstacles in the way of the proposed concessions; the resistance not merely of the Tories and High Churchmen, but perhaps of the Whigs in opposition, notwithstanding all their previous pledges. "It would be difficult enough," said Sunderland, "to repeal the Schism and Occasional Conformity Acts, but any attack upon the Test Act also "would ruin all." Stanhope, after some opposition, yielded to these views, and joined Sunderland in advising the Dissenters to forego for the present a part of their pretensions. The Ministers promised that the repeal of the Test Act should be proposed at a future and more favourable opportunity; and the King himself, who had taken a much warmer interest in this than in most English questions, spoke in the same sense to Lord Barrington, one of the dissenting body: the Dissenters acquiesced, and it was determined that only some few of the less important clauses of the Test Act should be comprised in the measure of relief.

With this compromise, Lord Stanhope brought forward his measure in the Lords on the 13th of December, under the specious name of an Act for strengthening the Protestant interest. He endeavoured to show the reason and advantage of restoring Dissenters to their natural rights, and of easing them from these stigmatising and oppressive laws, which, he said, had been made in turbulent times, and obtained by indirect methods; and he argued, that by the union of all true Protestants, the Church of England would still be the head of all the Protestant churches, and the Archbishop of Canterbury become the patriarch of all the Protestant clergy. Lords Sunderland and Stamford made some observations (of these we have no record) in support of the motion. But a powerful combination immediately appeared against it.

The Duke of Devonshire first complained that the House was taken by surprise, and that it was irregular to bring in a Bill of so great consequence without previous notice, forgetting, until Stanhope reminded him, that the very same course had been pursued by himself two years before, in bringing forward a still more important measure, the Septennial Act. The Earl of Nottingham observed, with a sneer, that the Church of England was certainly the happiest Church in the world, since even the greatest contradictions—two Acts made for her security, and the repeal of those very Acts—were all said to contribute to her support. Earl Cowper declared himself favourable to the repeal of the Schism Act, but apprehensive for the security of the Test and Corporation Acts, “because he “looked upon those Acts as the main bulwark of our “excellent constitution in church and state, and therefore “would have them inviolably preserved and untouched.” The Earl of Isla said that he considered the measure a violation of the Treaty of Union with Scotland.

The discussion being postponed till the 18th, was on that day almost entirely confined to the Right Reverend Bench. Both the Archbishops (Doctors Wake and Dawes) declared against the measure; his Grace of Canterbury observing, “that the scandalous practice of occasional “conformity was condemned by the soberest part of the “Dissenters themselves; and that he could not forbear “saying that some amongst them made a wrong use of “the favour and indulgence that was shown them upon “the Revolution, though they had the least share in that “happy event.” He also derived an argument against the measure from the lenity of the Government; urging that since the Schism Act had never been enforced, and was, in fact, a dead letter, it seemed needless to make a law to repeal it. Several other prelates took the same course. On the other hand, the Bill was strongly defended by Bishops Hoadley, Willis, Gibson, and Kennett.\* The latter, however, hurried away by his zeal, was be-

\* Bishop Kennett was rather less indulgent to Roman Catholics. In his MS. Diary he appears much displeased with Swift, whom he heard “instructing a young nobleman that the best poet in “England was Mr. Pope—a Papist!” (See Swift's Works, vol. xvi. p. 100.)



trayed into some very unseemly remarks on the clergy in Charles the First's reign, who, he said, "had promoted "arbitrary measures and persecutions, until they first "brought scandal and contempt upon the clergy, and at "last ruin both upon church and state"—a reflection, which, as Lord Lansdowne smartly observed in his reply, would have much better become a descendant of Bradshaw than a successor of Laud!

The debate was continued on the following day, and was concluded by a division of 86 for the Bill and 68 against it—so large a minority that the Ministers felt themselves compelled, in Committee, to comply with Cowper's amendments, and to strike out the clauses referring to the Test and Corporation Acts. With this mutilation the Bill was sent down to the Commons. A sharp debate ensued on the 7th of January, and in the list of those who spoke we find the name of almost every man of any political note in the House; but even the meagre and scanty records which are usually given of speeches at this period fail us here, the gallery having been on that day closed against strangers. We only know that Walpole and his friends warmly opposed the Bill, that some personal altercation arose between him and Lechmere, and that on a division there appeared 243 Ayes to 202 Noes. It was observed that even this small majority was gained chiefly by the Scotch Members, for, of 37 that were in the House, 34 voted for the Bill. It passed, however, without much further debate, and without any change.

When we consider the powerful combination by which this Bill was opposed, and the narrow majority by which it was carried in both Houses, we can hardly doubt that Sunderland judged rightly in his wish to exclude the Test Act from its provisions, and that, had Stanhope's vehemence prevailed, the whole measure would have miscarried. But the "more favourable opportunity" promised the Dissenters for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts never came. Those Acts remained on the Statute book one hundred and nine years more, but remained only like rusty weapons hung in an armoury, trophies of past power, not instruments of further aggression or defence. An Indemnity Bill, passed every year

from the first of George the Second (there were some, but very few, exceptions\*) threw open the gates of all offices to Protestant Dissenters as fully as if the law had been repealed; and if they still wished its repeal, it was because they thought it an insult, not because they felt it an injury.

The Parliament was prorogued on the 18th of April. In His Majesty's speech allusion was made to his design of passing the summer in his German dominions, and he accordingly set out for them a few weeks afterwards. Stanhope, though appointed one of the Lords Justices, was the Minister who attended the King abroad. The Duchess of Kendal also, as usual, accompanied His Majesty. No mention was made in the Regency of the Prince and Princess of Wales, who thereupon indignantly retired into the country. Nor were they deputed to hold levees during the King's absence, that duty, to the great scandal of the public, and further divulgement of family discord, being assigned to the young Princesses.

\* See Mr. Hallam's Const. Hist., vol. iii. p. 334.

## CHAPTER X.

IN England, as in France, the hopes of Alberoni rested more on internal factions, than on foreign arms. He knew the numbers and influence of the English Jacobites; he heard the clamours of the opposition against the Spanish war, and he trusted that the party which so eagerly echoed his manifestoes in the House of Commons would be as ready to support him in his schemes against the reigning family. But in this he was certainly quite deceived. Most statesmen bred in despotic monarchies utterly mistake the nature of our Parliamentary warfare, and cannot distinguish between the loyal subject who declaims against a Minister, and the traitor who plots against the Throne. Flushed with vain hopes, and finding the prospect of the Swedish invasion closed by the death of Charles the Twelfth, Alberoni resolved to assist the Pretender with an expedition of his own. Accordingly, he gave directions for equipping a formidable armament at Cadiz, and offered its command to the Duke of Ormond, the same general who some years before had led an English expedition against Spain, who had attempted Cadiz, and stormed Vigo! But such are only the common vicissitudes of exiles; they are used as tools by those who once felt them as foes. The Pretender himself was also invited to Spain, not indeed to head the vanguard of the invading army, but to be able to join it speedily, in the event of its safe landing and prosperous progress.

Since the influence of France had compelled him to cross the Pyrenees, James had resided sometimes at Urbino and sometimes at Rome. He had lately, to the great joy of his party, contracted a marriage with Princess Clementina, the grand-daughter of John Sobieski, late King of Poland, and she was on her way to join her betrothed husband, when she was arrested and detained at Inspruck, in the Imperial territories: a fa-

vour of the Emperor to the English Government unworthy of them to solicit, and base in him to grant. The memory of John Sobieski, the heroic deliverer of Vienna, might have claimed more gratitude from the son of the Prince whom he had saved. The Chevalier did not hesitate to accept Alberoni's invitation to Spain; but knowing the great power of the Imperialists in Italy, and seeing by the affair at Inspruck how readily that power would be exerted against him, especially while a British fleet rode victorious in the Mediterranean, he thought stratagem requisite to effect his design. He pretended to set out to the northward with the Earls of Mar and Perth, and in reality despatched those noblemen and a part of his suite, who, as he expected, were arrested at Voghera, he being supposed to be amongst them. They were conveyed to the castle of Milan, and some time elapsed before the mistake was discovered and the prisoners were released. The news that the Pretender was taken had meanwhile spread abroad, and Lord Stair had written it in triumph to the Ministers in London. Under the cover of this report, James secretly embarked at the little port of Nettuno; and after touching at Cagliari, landed at Rosas in the beginning of March, 1719. There being then no further object in mystery, he was received at Madrid, not only publicly, but Royally; his residence was appointed in the palace of Buen Retiro, and visits were paid to him as to the King of England by Philip and his Queen. The magnificence of his entry and public reception is extolled by Spanish writers. But I may observe in passing, that the ancient splendour of the Court of Madrid had long since faded away, during the melancholy reigns of the last Austrian Princes, and that the subsequent accounts of it which the Spaniards are still inclined to utter and we to receive are often indebted to fancy for their brilliant colouring. Never, for example, was there an occasion when splendour would have been more natural and becoming — when it better accorded with the popular feeling, or had been ushered in by longer preparation — than the first public entry of Philip himself in February, 1701, four months after the death of Charles the Second; yet never was there a pageant more mean and unsightly. For

when we discard the national exaggerations, and look to the impartial testimony of an Englishman, who happened to be present, we find that "His Majesty entered in a filthy old coach of the late King, without guards; his better sort of attendants, some on horseback and some in coaches, at half an hour's distance from one another; and divers of the inferior sort attending the baggage, in so very ragged clothes as exposed them extremely to the scorn of the Spaniards." At the same time order was so ill preserved, that "no less than forty men, women, and children, were trod under foot and killed outright, and above one hundred are now said to be languishing under their bruises, and dying daily."\*

On James's arrival at Madrid, the orders for sailing were despatched to the armament at Cadiz. It consisted of five men of war and about twenty transports, with 5000 soldiers, partly Irish, on board, and arms for 30,000 more. Several of the chief exiles of 1715 took part in this enterprise. Ormond himself was to embark when the fleet touched at Coruña, and to assume its command with the title of Captain-General of the King of Spain.† He was provided with a proclamation to be published at his landing, in the name of Philip, declaring that His Majesty had determined to send part of his forces as auxiliaries to King James; that he hoped Providence would favour so just a cause; but that the fear of ill success should not hinder any person from declaring for it, since he promised a secure retreat in his dominions to all that should join him; and, in case they were forced to leave their country, he engaged that every sea or land officer should have the same rank as he enjoyed in Great Britain, and the soldiers be received and treated like his own.

In England, meanwhile, the King and Ministers were still more active for their own defence. The Duke of Orleans, eager to requite a similar favour, had sent them timely warning of the intended expedition ‡; and he

\* Mr. Jackson to Mr. Pepys, Feb. 24. 1701. Pepys's Correspondence.

† Duke of Ormond to the Pretender, March 17. and 27. 1719. Stuart Papers.

‡ Letter of Abbé Dubois to Earl Stanhope, March 15. 1719. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxviii. He gives all the details of the Chevalier's embarkation at Nettuno, says that Cammock had gone to



offered them the aid of any number of his troops. These were declined; but six battalions were accepted and came over from the Austrians in the Netherlands, and two thousand men from the States-General—a very doubtful policy, where the strength of the foreign succour was by no means such as to counterbalance the disgrace of employing it. The English troops were disposed to the best advantage, especially in the north and west. A squadron of our ships, under Sir John Norris, rode in the Channel. Both Houses assured the King of their support, and a proclamation was issued offering 10,000*l.* for the apprehension of Ormond on his landing.\*

But on this occasion it might be said of George, as once of Honorius †, that winds and storms fought upon his side. Scarcely had the Spanish fleet lost sight of Cape Finisterre before it was assailed by a tremendous tempest. The surges of the Bay of Biscay, lashed into fury by a hurricane for twelve days, scattered all the ships from each other, and tossed them far and wide. In the extremity of danger most of the crews cast overboard the horses, the guns, the stands of arms, in order to lighten the vessels; others were dismantled or unrigged; and the same ports which had lately sent them forth strong and well appointed ships saw them return one by one as crippled wrecks. Against such disasters even the genius of Alberoni could not strive, and all further thoughts of the expedition were abandoned.‡

It was only a further aggravation of the calamity of him at Rome *déguisé en matelot*, and that Ormond passed the Pyrenees *déguisé en valet*. He offers as aid “*tout ce que nous pourrions faire pour la conservation de la France si elle était en danger.*”

\* There were two proclamations, one at Dublin and the other in London; the one offering 10,000*l.* and the other 5000*l.* A strange distinction! (Boyer's *Polit. State*, 1719, vol. i. p. 41. and 336.) The Duke's house, in St. James's Square, was about this time set up to auction by the Government; it was sold to a Mr. Hackett for 7500*l.*

† The noble lines of Claudian are well known:—

“O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris  
Æolus armatas hyemes, cui militat æther,  
Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti!”

(De III. Cons. Honor. v. 96.)

‡ Ormond himself had written to Alberoni from Coruña, (March 22. 1719, Stuart Papers,) requesting a delay, or in fact a relinquish-

this tempest to the Jacobites that two frigates escaped its violence and pursued their voyage to Scotland, since, thus unsupported, they could of course only bring ruin on those whom they conveyed and on those who welcomed them. On board were the Earls Marischal and Seaforth, and the Marquis of Tullibardine, with some arms and about 300 Spanish soldiers. They landed on the 16th of April at Kintail in Ross-shire; and the frigates putting out again to sea, left them scarcely any alternative but to become either conquerors or captives. Their first object was concealment, in order to await the expected landing of Ormond in England; accordingly, they scarcely advanced beyond Kintail\*, and for some time the Government believed that they had re-embarked. A few hundred Highlanders joined them, either the devoted adherents of the exiled Lords, or the bold adventurers that always swarm in a lawless country, but there was no general gathering of the clans.† During some weeks they appear to have remained unmolested; a strong proof of the unwillingness to give information, and of the thorough disaffection of that district to the existing government. At length some ships of war coming to that coast retook Donan Castle, of which the rebels had made themselves masters; and General, now Lord, Carpenter, who commanded in Scotland, directed some forces against them from Inverness. The officer employed in this service was General Wightman: he had with him

ment of the enterprise, as its design was already known to France and England. He could not, he says, be so imprudent as to propose to attack England with 5000 men, unless by surprise.

\* According to San Phelipe, Lord Seaforth went on to Bracaam (Coment. vol. ii. p. 216.); meaning, probably, as has been suggested to me, Brahan Castle, the chief seat of the Mackenzies. The names in San Phelipe are often strangely distorted. With him the Duke de Maine, for instance, becomes *Humena*; Lord Townshend, *Fouveskendem*; and Lord Cobham, *Chacon*.

† "A resolution had been universally taken not to move in Scotland till England was fairly engaged." (Lockhart's Mem. vol. ii. p. 22.) The Jacobites at Edinburgh were also on their guard against false rumours. An express came to them from Lord Stormont in Annandale, that Ormond's fleet had been seen to pass that coast; "but I gave it no credit," says Lockhart, "when I perceived his Lordship's letter was dated at one in the morning, about which time I knew he was apt to credit any news that pleased him."

about 1000 men, and found the insurgents above 2000 strong, occupying a strong position across the narrow valley of Glenshiel. Making the best disposition of his scanty force, he began the attack on the evening of the 10th of June, the Pretender's birthday. The triumph of discipline over numbers was on this occasion easy and complete; the Highlanders did not venture to come to a close engagement, but were driven from rock to rock, until they dispersed in confusion along the mountain sides. The loss of the King's troops scarcely exceeded 20 killed and 120 wounded. The Highlanders, swift of foot and familiar with the country, easily made their escape one by one to their homes; but the Spaniards, who had no such facilities, and who kept together as a body, were compelled to surrender at discretion. They were sent prisoners to Edinburgh, where the leading Jacobites vied with each other in showing civilities, and even advancing money, to the officers.\* As for General Wightman, "I am taking a tour," he writes, "through "all the difficult passes of Seaforth's country, to terrify "the rebels by burning the houses of the guilty, and pre-"serving those of the honest."† It may be doubted, however, whether this delicate operation would be performed with the nice discrimination it required, and whether hasty and exasperated soldiers were always the best possible judges of who had and who had not a leaning to the Jacobites.

The three leaders of this forlorn hope, Lords Tullibardine, Marischal, and Seaforth (the last of whom had been wounded in the action), succeeded in escaping a surrender, which, in their case, would have been the first step to the scaffold. They took shelter in the Western Isles, where they lurked till the ardour of pursuit had abated, and then embarked in disguise for Spain. The further fate of these eminent exiles was very various. Seaforth received the Royal pardon in 1726, and returned to Scotland, where he passed the remainder of his days

\* Lockhart's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 23. "The great straits of the "officers," he says, "appeared even in their looks, though their Spanish "pride would not allow them to complain."

† General Wightman to Lord Carpenter, June 17. 1719. *London Gazette*.

(till 1740) in quiet retirement. Tullibardine survived to share the enterprise of Prince Charles in 1745, and to die next year of a broken heart in the Tower. The Earl Marischal, with his brother, James Keith, after various vicissitudes, entered the Prussian service; where the latter rose to the rank of Field Marshal, and to the friendship of Frederick, and closed his heroic life on the fatal field of Hochkirchen. On his part Lord Marischal was employed in civil affairs; went on missions into France and Spain; and in the evening of his life, when in need of repose, was appointed Governor of the little state of Neuchatel. It was there that, in 1762, he became the patron and friend of Rousseau, who has drawn an interesting portrait of his honoured old age. "He used," says that eloquent writer, "to call me his child, and I called him my father. . . . . When first I beheld this venerable man, my first feeling was to grieve over his sunk and wasted frame; but when I raised my eyes on his noble features, so full of fire, and so expressive of truth, I was struck with admiration. . . . . My Lord Marischal, though a wise man, is not free from defects. With the most penetrating glance, with the nicest judgment, with the deepest knowledge of mankind, he yet is sometimes misled by prejudices, and can never be disabused of them. There is something strange and wayward in his turn of mind. He appears to forget the persons he sees every day, and remembers them at the moment when they least expect it; his attentions appear unseasonable, and his presents capricious. He gives or sends away on the spur of the moment whatever strikes his fancy, whether of value or whether a trifle. A young Genevese, who wished to enter the service of the King of Prussia, being one day introduced to him, my Lord gave him, instead of a letter, a small satchel full of peas, which he desired him to deliver to His Majesty. On receiving this singular recommendation, the King immediately granted a commission to the bearer. These high intellects have between them a secret language which common minds can never understand. Such little eccentricities, like the caprices of a pretty woman, rendered the society of my Lord Marischal only the

“more interesting, and never warped in his mind either  
“the feelings or the duties of friendship.”\*

After the failure of Ormond's expedition, the Pretender could no longer forward the views of Spain; his presence at Madrid was only an additional bar to peace, and his entertainment an additional burden on the treasury. Alberoni, therefore, began to wish for his departure, and the Prince himself to be weary of his stay. A pretext alone was wanting on both sides, when news was brought that Princess Sobieski had contrived to make her escape from Inspruck, and to reach Bologna without further molestation. Her liberation was mainly contrived by Charles Wogan, who had been one of the prisoners of Preston, and who continued a most devoted partisan of the Stuart cause. Arriving at Inspruck under a false name, he obtained admittance for a female servant of one Mrs. Missat, into the convent where Clementina was confined, and proposed, without letting her fully into the secret, that she should change clothes with the Princess. But, at nearly the last moment, Jenny, the maid-servant, hearing Wogan and his companions name the word “Princess” to each other, became acquainted with the real rank of the person concerned, and afraid of engaging any further in an affair of state. Many fair words and some pieces of gold were tried in vain to persuade her; but her female resolution melted away before the well-timed promise of a beautiful suit of brocade belonging to her mistress. Thus taking advantage of a storm of wind and hail, and, consequently, a dark night, the Princess assumed the disguise of Jenny, came out of the gate in her place, and set forth on the horses which Wogan kept ready; and, notwithstanding bad roads and worse weather, she never rested in her journey, till she had left the Austrian, and entered the Venetian, territories.† At these tidings, which afforded the desired pretext for de-

\* Rousseau, *Confessions*, livre xii. But I cannot swallow his peas.

† *Tales of a Grandfather*, vol. ii. p. 212. ed. 1830. Wogan was knighted for this service by the Pope. He afterwards entered the Spanish service, and became a valued correspondent of Swift. (*Works*, vol. xvii. p. 438, &c.)



parture, James immediately took leave of the Spanish Court, and returned to Italy, to solemnise his marriage.

Alberoni had hoped that a few of the shattered ships of Ormond's fleet might be speedily repaired and sent out; not, indeed, for their original destination, but for the smaller object of rousing and exciting the malcontents in Brittany. Partly, however, from necessary repairs, and partly from the dilatory disposition of Don Blas de Loya, the officer intrusted with this enterprise, the proper time for it slipped by, and the French Government was enabled to pour troops into the disaffected province, and to quell every hope of a rising.\*

Nor was the campaign on the Pyrenean frontier less adverse to the views of Alberoni. Early in April, the French had taken the field with more than 30,000 men; and though Villars had refused the command, it had been accepted by Berwick. It was strange to see the conqueror of Almanza warring against Philip the Fifth, and the father of the Duke of Liria in arms against his son; but it was known that his cold temper was seldom stirred by any personal partialities; and that his stern sense of duty never yielded either to terror or temptation. On the other side, the Spaniards, the flower of whose forces was in Sicily, could muster only a few regiments of worn-out veterans or raw recruits.

Philip, nevertheless, determined to put himself at the head of those forces, deceived by the flattering representations of his agents, and trusting that, at his approach, the French soldiers would quit their ranks and hail as their chief the only surviving grandson of Louis the Fourteenth. He arrived at Pamplona, attended by the Queen, the Prince of Asturias, and the Prime Minister; and, in pursuance of his hopes, prepared an address to the soldiers of Berwick, and assigned the very regiments in which those who should come over were to be enrolled. Nay, so confident was he of the issue, that he had formed

\* "J'ai lu le procès de ceux qui furent exécutés à Nantes. Je me suis entretenu plusieurs fois avec quelques uns des juges et de ceux qui furent effigés; je n'ai jamais vu de complot plus mal organisé. Plusieurs ne savaient pas exactement de quoi il était question ou ne s'accordaient pas les uns avec les autres." (Duclos, *Mém.* vol. ii. p. 30. ed. 1791.)

the design of advancing almost alone amongst the French troops, and claiming their allegiance as the rightful Regent. But Alberoni, afraid to endanger His Majesty's person in this romantic enterprise, opposed it by urgent remonstrances; and, finding these received with less docility than usual, contrived to defeat it by a false order, and consequent delay of the Royal attendants.

The King's proclamation to the French soldiers was, however, published. But the instinct of military obedience is too strong to be broken, except on very rare occasions and by very extraordinary men. The French troops, so far from deserting, advanced rapidly from conquest to conquest; and Philip was reduced to remain an indignant spectator of reverses which he could neither hinder nor avenge. M. de Silly, who commanded the army before the coming of Berwick, passed the Bidassoa and reduced Port Passage, where he found six large men of war on the stocks nearly finished; and these, at the instigation of Colonel William Stanhope (he had been sent on a mission to the French army), were committed to the flames. The arsenal and magazines were also consumed, and the total loss of the Spaniards on this occasion has been estimated at not less than two millions of dollars. Fuenterrabia was then invested, and after a stubborn defence surrendered on the 18th of June. The next enterprise of the invaders was partly naval. An English squadron having appeared off the coast as an auxiliary, eight hundred French soldiers were embarked and conveyed to Santoña, another naval station, where Alberoni had carried on the construction of his fleet. The fortress was destitute of regular troops, and garrisoned only by some Miquelets and armed peasants of the neighbourhood, who fled at the first fire. On taking possession of the place, the French, as at Passages, burnt three ships of war on the stocks, and the materials for seven more — a conflagration which, following the action off Cape Fas-saro and the tempest off Cape Finisterre, completed the destruction of the Spanish navy, and was ascribed to the maritime jealousy of England.\*

\* . . . . Que era el principal designio de los Ingleses, suspirando siempre, porque España no tenga navios, para aprovecharse así de los

Marshal Berwick next turned his arms against St. Sebastian, and obtained possession of the city on the 2d, of the citadel on the 17th of August, while Philip, whose force did not exceed 15,000 men, could do nothing for its relief, and was compelled to return to Madrid without striking a blow. At the close of the campaign the whole of Guipuzcoa was in the hands of the French; and the States of that province even offered to acknowledge their dominion, on the condition that their own rights and liberties should be secured.\* That this offer, which would only have increased the jealousy of the Allies and the difficulties of a peace, was promptly rejected by the French government, need excite no surprise, but it does seem strange to find such an offer proceed from that loyal people. We find, however, on further investigation, that Alberoni, in his eagerness to establish a new and uniform tariff for trade, and to regulate the inland custom-houses between the various kingdoms of the monarchy, had despotically broken through and trampled on the ancient and cherished privileges of the Basques. It seems, in fact, the peculiar curse of all those who have attempted to regenerate Spain, that they think it necessary in the first place to destroy the liberties and laws which they find already happily established in some provinces, and to reduce every thing to the same dead level of servitude — to clear the ground, as they say, for a more regular structure; and thus, while they profess an extension of freedom, their first step is always to abridge it.

Although the surrender of Santoña closed the campaign in Biscay, the north of Spain was exposed to further aggressions both from the French and English. The French troops entered Catalonia, where they took some small forts, and attempted Rosas. A British squadron sailed from Spithead on the 21st of September with 4000 troops on

tesoros de las Indias con los suyos. (San Phelipe, Coment. vol. ii. p. 233.)

\* This proposal was made from Guipuzcoa only, and not from Biscay and Alava, as stated by Cox. (House of Bourbon, vol. ii. p. 354.) He is also mistaken in saying that the French took Urgel (it was not taken at all), and that the British squadron which had co-operated with their army took Vigo; other ships performed that service.

board, who were commanded by Lord Cobham, and intended to attack Coruña; but on approaching the Spanish coast and obtaining further information, this project was abandoned as too hazardous, and Cobham resolved to turn his arms against Vigo, where he heard that many of Ormond's stores still remained. Vigo had few regular troops to defend it; and when the British landed at three miles from the town they found only some armed peasants, who showed their zeal rather than their judgment in keeping up a heavy fire of musketry from the distant mountains. Of course not a single shot from thence could reach its destination; and in this exertion either the ammunition or the courage of the Gallicians appears to have become exhausted, since they did not show themselves in arms again.\* I may observe, that a similar story is told of the Spanish army in the night before the battle of Talavera.†

The garrison of Vigo, having first spiked the cannon in the town, left it open to the English, and retired into the citadel; this also yielded on the 21st of October, after a few days' siege. The English found 43 pieces of ordnance, 2000 barrels of powder, and chests of arms containing about 8000 muskets; all these, relics of Ormond's armament, and seven sloops, were seized in the harbour. The neighbouring towns of Redondella and Pontevedra were also sacked by the troops, who were then re-embarked for England; and thus ended an attack by no means unattended either with honour or advantage, but hardly equal to the vaunts with which the "Important and Secret Expedition" had been ushered in to public notice. The Court of Madrid, however, showed great consternation at the news; the number of the English and their object were unknown; both appeared magnified

\* There was no want of a favourable opportunity for the Spaniards. We learn, from the journals of an officer present, that on the very next day "most of the soldiers abused themselves so much with wine, that a small body of men might have given us a great deal of uneasiness." (Boyer's *Polit. State*, 1719, vol. ii. p. 401.)

† "About twelve o'clock, the Spaniards on the right, being alarmed at some horse in their front, opened a prodigious peal of musketry and artillery, which continued for twenty minutes without any object." (Napier's *Penins. War*, vol. ii. p. 394.)

through the mist of uncertainty, and it was feared that they might be only the vanguard of a large invading army. Such repeated alarms and reverses could not fail to rouse even the sluggish nature of Philip, and to shake his confidence in his baffled Minister.

If from Biscay or Gallicia the eye of the King of Spain turned to Sicily and his main army, it could not even there be gladdened by any very cheering prospect. After the reduction of Messina, the Marquis de Lede had with a part of his forces undertaken the siege of Melazzo; a place well fortified and of great natural strength, built upon a narrow headland which juts out a long way into the sea.\* It had withstood the Duke de Vivonne in 1675†; but it would probably have yielded to the persevering attack of the Spaniards, had not General Caraffa, with about 8000 Germans, come to reinforce the garrison from Naples, and, sallying forth, fought a sharp action with the enemy. Both armies then drew intrenchments opposite one another on the plain, and remained encamped all the winter without coming to any further engagement, and both suffering alike from the *MALARIA* of that marshy soil, and from that inaction which, as Spinola used to say, is sufficient to kill any General.‡ But very different were the prospects of the Germans and Spaniards for the future. The former, masters of the sea by the assistance of the British squadron, were assured of constant supplies in the winter, and of large reinforcements in the spring; while the Spaniards, since the destruction of their fleet cooped up within the limits of the island, durst hope for no other succours than such as a few light ships and feluccas escaping the vigilance of the enemy occasionally brought them, and could neither improve a victory nor repair a defeat.

\* The present state of Melazzo is well described by Capt. Smyth (Sicily, p. 103.); but he need hardly have told us that "the garrison is always commanded by a military officer."

† Muratori, *Annal. d'Ital.* vol. xi. p. 330. Boileau prudently glides over this reverse in his ingenious letters to the Duke de Vivonne, and does not blush to make Voiture exclaim from the dead, "Nous avons ici César, Pompée, et Alexandre. Ils trouvent tous que vous avez assez attrapé leur air dans votre manière de combattre! Sur-tout César vous trouve très César."

‡ See the Life of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, p. 165. ed. 1809.



In the month of May the Austrian reinforcements, 10,000 foot and 3000 horse, were mustered at Naples, and Count Mercy arrived from Vienna to take the command of the whole army. The troops sailed on the 22d from the Bay of Baiæ, and landed on the 28th in the Bay of Patti. At the news of their landing the Spaniards immediately decamped from before Melazzo, with so much precipitation as to leave behind them their sick, two thousand sacks of flour, and some pieces of cannon, and retreated to the inland post of Franca Villa, about thirty-two miles distant. Count Mercy, having relieved Melazzo, determined to march against them; but nearly three weeks elapsed before his preparations were completed. In that age the Austrian troops were always slow of motion, and strangely ill-supplied. Their army surgeons, for instance, were very few and unskilled; and it is observed, by a contemporary, that with their soldiers there was little difference between being wounded and killed in action, except that of a lingering or a sudden death.

At length on the 27th of June Count Mercy left Melazzo at the head of 21,000 men. They had a most toilsome march for three days over rugged and dreary mountains and under a burning sun, led by unwilling guides, and harassed by the armed peasants of the country. Arriving at length on the heights of Tre Fontane they discovered the Spaniards encamped below in the plain of Franca Villa, and a shout of joy ran through the whole army at the prospect of a speedy and decisive action. The Spaniards, though in a plain, held a strong position; their front protected by the steep banks of the river Alcantara\*, their wings by intrenchments, their rear by rocky ground and by the little town of Franca Villa. In advance of them, and on the other side of the stream, was a convent of Capuchins, crowning a single hill, and this De Lede had occupied with his best troops, the Royal Guards, headed by the brave Villadarias. Next morning the battle was begun by the Germans in three different places, and soon became general. The brunt of it was at

\* The river must have been nearly dry at that season. I crossed it much lower down in the month of November, and found very little water.

the Capuchin convent, which was attacked in succession by the flower of the German forces, but which Villadarias most gallantly defended. At length Count Mercy himself, hoping to animate his troops by his presence and example, put himself at the head of another charge, but with no better success; his soldiers were repulsed, his horse killed under him, and himself severely wounded. At the close of day the victory had every where declared in favour of De Lede, and the Germans, though still in good order, withdrew from their attacks. They had upwards of 3000 men killed and wounded, the Spaniards not half so many; and it must, I think, be owned that the steadiness of the latter under the forlorn and disheartening prospects of their arms in Sicily, was highly honourable to the national character, and another proof how little it can ever be daunted by reverses.

But this victory produced only barren laurels. De Lede could not or would not pursue his advantages; and the enemy, recovering from their discomfiture, were soon enabled to undertake the siege of Messina. The citadel made a most resolute defence, but not being relieved by the Spaniards, was compelled to surrender on the 18th of October. A further body of 6000 Germans, intended for the conquest of Sardinia, were diverted from their destination until Sicily should be quite subdued, and they sailed from Genoa to join the forces of Mercy.\* A part of the army was then transported by sea to the fortress of Trapani, from whence it spread itself abroad, and reduced the cities of Mazzara and Marsala; so that at the close of 1719, De Lede, who had fixed his head-quarters at Castel Vetrano, trembled for the capital itself.

Cardinal Alberoni, on receiving intelligence of the victory of Franca Villa, availed himself of the transient gleam which it cast upon the Spanish arms to signify his consent to a peace. He was far, however, from yet yielding to the terms required by the Allies, and giving his unqualified adhesion to the Quadruple Treaty. His plan

\* It appears that the English Ministers during all the summer strongly remonstrated with the Austrian on their employing such insufficient forces. "Je n'ai cessé de le représenter à M. de Penther," writes Stanhope to St. Saphorin, July 31. 1719. (Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxix.)

was, that the States-General should be mediators, and that Spain should not relinquish Sicily and Sardinia, unless the French were prepared to restore their conquests, and the English to yield Gibraltar and Port Mahon. With these proposals he sent his countryman, Marquis Scotti, the Envoy from Parma, directing him to travel to Paris, lay his mission before the Regent, and then proceed to the Hague. The Regent, however, on receiving the communication of Scotti, positively refused him passports to continue his journey, declaring that he must previously consult the Emperor and the King of England. Dubois wrote accordingly to Stanhope at Hanover. But the British Minister, knowing the restless temper and ambitious views of Alberoni, and how little reliance could be placed on his professions and promises, thought that the time for negotiation with him had gone by, and said in his answer to Dubois\*, "We shall act  
"wrong if we do not consolidate the peace by the removal  
"of the Minister who has kindled the war; and as he  
"will never consent to peace till he finds his ruin inevitable, from the continuance of the war, we must make  
"his disgrace an absolute condition of the peace. For,  
"as his unbounded ambition has been the sole cause of  
"the war which he undertook, in defiance of the most  
"solemn engagements, and in breach of the most solemn  
"promises, if he is compelled to accept peace he will  
"only yield to necessity, with the resolution to seize the  
"first opportunity of vengeance. It is not to be imagined  
"that he will ever lose sight of his vast designs, or lay  
"aside the intention of again bringing them forward  
"whenever the recovery of his strength, and the remission of the Allied Powers, may flatter him with the  
"hopes of better success. He is skilled in procuring all  
"the connections necessary for the accomplishment of  
"his schemes. He will be careful to cultivate those  
"connections, and in due time he will employ them so  
"much the more dangerously for your nation and ours,  
"inasmuch as his past imprudencies will render him  
"more circumspect, and his past failures more ardent.

\* Stanhope to Dubois, Hanover, August 22. 1719. *Hardwicke Papers*, and *Coxe's Copies*. Original in French.

“ He himself has warned us against the dangers of a  
 “ deceitful peace ; he is incapable of consenting to any  
 “ other ; he thinks it no reproach to do any thing to  
 “ which his strength is equal ; and we ought to thank  
 “ God that he did not more exactly calculate his power,  
 “ and his undertakings. He acknowledges no other  
 “ peace but exhaustion and weakness ; and when, there-  
 “ fore, he is reduced to these, let us not allow him to  
 “ recover. Let us exact from Philip his dismissal from  
 “ Spain. We cannot propose to His Majesty any condi-  
 “ tion which will be more advantageous both for himself  
 “ and his people. Let us hold forth this example to  
 “ Europe, as a means of intimidating any turbulent Mi-  
 “ nister who breaks the most solemn treaties, and attacks  
 “ the persons of Princes in the most scandalous manner.  
 “ When Cardinal Alberoni is once driven from Spain,  
 “ the Spaniards will never consent to his again coming  
 “ into administration ; even their Catholic Majesties will  
 “ have suffered too much from his pernicious counsels to  
 “ desire his return. In a word, any peace made by the  
 “ Cardinal will be only an armistice of uncertain dura-  
 “ tion ; nor can we depend upon any treaty till we make  
 “ it with a Spanish Minister whose system is directly  
 “ opposite to that of Alberoni, as well in regard to France  
 “ in particular, as to Europe in general.”

This determination, backed by that of France, produced, as might be expected, a powerful effect at Madrid. However great the genius of the Prime Minister, men felt that it might be purchased too dearly by the prolongation of an unequal and disastrous war. His old friends began to drop from him ; his enemies to renew and redouble their attacks. The Confessor of Philip, finding that Alberoni wished to supplant him and appoint another to his office, immediately discovered that the Cardinal was a very dangerous Minister. The ASSA FETA, moved by some womanish resentments\*, began to shake his influ-

\* Alberoni, during the last few months of his power, had grown more and more imperious. “ Muchos hombres,” says San Phelipe, “ dignos de la mayor atencion, salian ajados de su presencia . . . . . “ Decian algunos que menores trabajos havian padecido en tan dilatada guerra que en estas violencias de un Estrangero.” (Coment., vol. ii. p. 234.)

ence with her Royal mistress. The Grandees looked down with ignorant pride on the son of a gardener, and could neither forgive his origin below nor his elevation above them. Several of their order even went so far as to enter into a concert of measures with the Regent, who on his part well knew that though it might be unsafe to trust their friendships, he could rely on their sincerity of hatred.\* But the finishing stroke to the power of the mighty Minister came from an English hand—from one of the most singular and striking characters of that or of any age.

Charles Lord Mordaunt, born in 1658, became in 1689 Earl of Monmouth by creation, and in 1697 Earl of Peterborough by descent. As a military man his character stands deservedly high; as a diplomatist also he possessed great merit; but as a politician it seems scarcely possible to award him any praise. In that department, his splendid genius was utterly obscured and eclipsed by his wayward temper. Vain, selfish, and ungovernable—always in a quarrel, and on a journey—he was never thoroughly trusted by any party, nor perseveringly active at any place. His conduct in Fenwick's conspiracy appears to have been most unjustifiable, and provoked even the mild and cautious Somers into expressions of undisguised contempt:—"As to my Lord Monmouth, his discourses are "so various, and if those were of the same tenor, his resolutions are so changeable, that what he will do must "be left to chance. His main business is to get out of "the Tower, and in order to that he is ready to do any "thing."†—But it might not be difficult to confirm the least favourable features of his portrait from the words, not of his enemies, but of his personal and political friends:—"I can assure you," writes Bolingbroke to the ambassador at the Hague, "that all I found by the letters sent "by the courier from Lord Peterborough was that his "head was extremely hot, and confused with various "indigested schemes." And again, "I may tell your "Excellency in confidence, that I have a letter of twenty

\* "Sensit (Artabanus) vetus regnandi, falsos in amore, odia non "fingere." (Tacit. Annal. lib. vi. c. 44.)

† Lord Somers to the Duke of Shrewsbury, January 26. 1696, printed in the Shrewsbury Correspondence.



" sheets from Lord Peterborough, wherein the whole world  
 " is parcelled out, as if with a FIAT and the breath of his  
 " mouth it could be accomplished."\* In the same corre-  
 spondence we find Prior sneering at Lord Peterborough's  
 fondness for Quixotic enterprises :—" I do not question  
 " but he will take Bender on his way home from Vienna."†  
 Pope observes, " He has too much wit as well as courage  
 " to make a solid general."‡ " I love the hangdog dearly,"  
 is the dubious praise of Swift.§ His friends suffered  
 from his weaknesses, and his servants profited by them.  
 On one occasion, when he was abroad, his steward pulled  
 down, without his knowledge, a wing of his country  
 house ; sold the materials for his own profit ; and, not  
 satisfied with this, actually sent my Lord a bill for  
 repairs ! || Yet sometimes Lord Peterborough showed  
 economy, like every thing else, by fits and in extremes.  
 " It is a comical sight," writes a lady from Bath in 1725,  
 " to see him with his blue riband and star, and a cabbage  
 " under each arm, or a chicken in his hand, which, after  
 " he himself has purchased at market, he carries home  
 " for his dinner."¶

This last of the knights-errant, while wandering in  
 Italy, in 1717, met with an adventure as unpleasant as  
 any of Don Quixote's. He was suddenly arrested at  
 Bologna, by order of the Papal Legate, and conveyed to  
 Fort Urbino, where he was closely imprisoned for a  
 month, and no person allowed to speak with him. It  
 appears that he was suspected of some design against the  
 Pretender's life—a charge of which it is hardly necessary  
 to assert the absolute falsehood\*\* ; and he was set at liberty

\* Letters to Lord Raby, May 8. and May 18. 1711.

† Prior to Lord Bolingbroke, Paris, Sept. 9. 1712.

‡ Pope to Swift, January 12. 1723.

§ Journal to Stella, January 10. 1713.

|| See Swift's Directions to Servants. (Works, vol. xii. p. 444.)

¶ Lady Hervey to Mrs. Howard, June 7. 1726. Suffolk Letters.

\*\* The conduct of King George's Government, as regards the Pre-  
 tender's life, was not only above suspicion, but most laudably active.  
 I find, for example, in Boyer's Political State, 1719, vol. ii. p. 344.,  
 that " Paul Miller, a private trooper in the Horse Grenadiers, having  
 " made a proposal to Mr. Secretary Craggs to go and assassinate the  
 " Pretender, was by Mr. Secretary's warrant presently taken into  
 " custody of Mr. Bill, the Messenger ; and the matter being laid

with every possible civility and reparation. The English Government, however, warmly resented this insult to an English subject, and it was for some time doubtful whether the squadron of Admiral Byng should not be directed to avenge it.

In the summer of 1719 Lord Peterborough was at Paris; and though neither employed nor trusted by his government, resolved to play some part in their affairs. He contrived to enter into confidential correspondence with the Duke of Parma, whom it was of great importance to detach from the cause of Alberoni, in order to prevail through the Duke upon his niece, the Queen of Spain. To prevent suspicion, Peterborough refused to proceed in person to the Duke's Court, but undertook to meet an accredited agent from Parma at Novi, in the Piedmontese States.\* There a conference was accordingly held; and there Peterborough, exerting his usual skill and meeting his usual success, obtained that letters should be immediately despatched to Queen Elizabeth Farnese, earnestly pressing for Alberoni's removal. At nearly the same time, Marquis Scotti having been gained by a present of fifty thousand crowns from the Regent, returned to Madrid to counterwork his late employer, and to use his personal influence over the mind of the Queen.

All these little rills of intrigue, when they flowed together, produced an irresistible torrent. On the evening of the 4th of December, Alberoni had transacted business as usual with the King, and seen no change in His Majesty; but next morning there was put into his hands a Royal Decree dismissing him from all his employments,

"before the Lords Justices, their Excellencies ordered that he should immediately be discharged out of His Majesty's service, and proceeded against with the utmost severity."

\* Earl of Peterborough to Earl Stanhope, Novi, Nov. 20. 1719. Appendix, vol. ii. According to San Phelipe, Lord Peterborough had been requested by the Regent to begin this negotiation, but it seems, on the contrary, to have proceeded solely from himself. Dubois writes to Stanhope (October 20. 1719, Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxviii.), "My Lord Peterborough est en liaison avec toute sorte de gens. . . . Il peut faire peu de bien et beaucoup plus de mal. "J'y prendrai garde sans l'effaroucher. Je rends très humbles "graces à V. Exc. de la bonté qu'elle a eu de m'avertir de ses indis-crétions."

and commanding him to leave Madrid in eight days, and the Spanish territories in twenty-one. All his endeavours to obtain an audience of the King or Queen were in vain; and, though permitted to write, he found his letter unheeded. He was compelled to set out within the time appointed, and had the further mortification of being overtaken at Lerida by an officer sent to search for papers which were missing from the public offices, and which were discovered in the Cardinal's baggage. It was, however, some consolation to him before his departure, to receive the visits and hear the condolences of larger and more splendid levees than had ever flocked around him in the meridian of his power. Many who had hitherto stood aloof, or even opposed him, now forgot his errors, and hastened to acknowledge his services. Such conduct the Cardinal himself calls a riddle\*: but it is familiar to the Spaniards: their noble character seldom bends before the mighty, and never turns aside from the fallen!

Cardinal Alberoni pursued his journey to Italy, where he passed the remainder of his long and checkered life; at first in exile and concealment, at length in Papal confidence and favour. He survived till 1752, and I shall hereafter have occasion to mention him again as fomenting the discords in the Pretender's family. His attempt against the little Republic of San Marino was still more unworthy; and even had it been successful, would have brought no advantage commensurate to its disgrace. But Alberoni could never remain tranquil. It would seem, in fact, as if superior talents were often conjoined by nature with a certain restlessness which compels them to seek out for themselves some employment. Few men who could be useful in action are happy in retirement.

It was hoped by the Court of Madrid that the dismissal of Alberoni would appease the Allied Powers, and obtain more favourable terms of peace. In reply to the States-General, Philip still continued to insist on the proposals lately made by his Minister, and to refuse his accession to the Quadruple Treaty. Under these circumstances both Stanhope and Dubois saw the necessity of renewed exertions. Stanhope undertook another journey

\* See his Apology, Hist. Register, 1722, p. 209.

to Paris, and concerted his measures with the French and the Imperial Ministers; and on the 19th of January, 1720, was signed by these three statesmen a declaration, binding themselves not to admit any conditions contrary to the Quadruple Alliance. Immediately afterwards Stanhope despatched Schaub, his confidential secretary, to carry a duplicate of this declaration to Madrid\*, while Dubois, on his part, sent directions to Marquis Scotti, Father d'Aubenton, and others in the French interest, to unite their exertions with Schaub's, and use their influence over Elizabeth. The struggle was arduous, from the difficulty of prevailing with the Queen; but that point once gained, it was more easy for her to prevail with her husband. Some difficulties that could not then be overcome were eluded by referring them to be discussed at a future Congress, to be held at Cambray. But on the 26th of January Philip issued a decree, announcing his accession to the Quadruple Alliance, and declaring that he gave peace to Europe at the expense of his rights and possessions. He also renewed his renunciations of the French Crown, and promised to evacuate Sicily and Sardinia within six months—a condition which he punctually performed. It is remarkable that the orders to the Marquis de Lede arrived just as the two armies, drawn out in front of Palermo, were in motion against each other, and on the point of engaging in a great and decisive battle. Thus was that unnecessary bloodshed successfully averted; and thus, by the firmness, skill, and union of the French and English Governments, and especially of Stanhope and Dubois, were laid the foundations of a solid and happy peace for Europe, which endured for upwards of twelve years.

In the affairs of the North the union of England and France was no less salutary. On the death of the King of Sweden, the new Queen had been glad to conclude a peace with George the First, and to yield to him the duchies of Bremen and Verden. Poland was satisfied with the acknowledgment of King Augustus. Prussia also, after much negotiation, agreed to a suspension of

\* This duplicate, with the original signatures, is preserved in the Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxvii.

arms, accepting Stettin and some other Swedish territory. But the Czar and the King of Denmark, seeing Sweden drained of men and money, and even of provisions\*, and deprived of her military ruler, were not to be appeased with moderate concessions, and sought for the total ruin of that monarchy. In this state of things, the Cabinet of St. James's combined with that of the Palais Royal to offer, and if necessary to enforce, their mediation between the warring powers. Lord Carteret, a young statesman of the highest promise, was sent ambassador to Stockholm; and Sir John Norris, with eleven men-of-war, sailed for the Baltic. Neither the Ambassador nor the Admiral could, at first, prevail. The Russian fleet ravaged the coasts of Sweden with dreadful havoc, burning above a thousand villages, and the town of Nyköping, which, next to Stockholm and Gothenburg, was reckoned the most considerable in the kingdom. Remonstrances and threats were used in vain; and at length Stanhope, then at Hanover, sent orders to Norris to treat the Russian fleet as Byng had the Spanish.† The Admiral consequently effected his junction with the Swedish men-of-war at Carlscroon, and was proceeding in search of their enemy, when the Czar, alarmed at this combination, and finding the intention serious, hastily recalled his fleet. Still, however, he brooded over future victories, and entertained no thoughts of peace. The Danes, being weaker, appeared more reasonable. They had already taken Marstrand, and threatened Gothenburg, when the interference of England forced them to desist, and to conclude a treaty, accepting a sum of money as an equivalent for their conquests.‡ And thus, in 1720, of the five

\* "Outre l'épuisement d'argent où les Suédois se trouvent, ils manquent aussi de vivres, et l'on nous mande qu'ils n'en ont que pour trois ou quatre mois pour tout le Royaume." (Stanhope to Dubois, Hanover, July 31. 1719. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxix.)

† "La Suède n'a donc plus d'autre ressource que notre escadre et elle en convient. Avec les quatre vaisseaux qui doivent incessamment joindre notre Amiral il en aura quinze, et pourvu que la Suède en ait 6 ou 8 nous hasarderons un combat, quoique nous ne soyons pas sans appréhension que les Danois ne viennent au secours des Russes." (Stanhope to Dubois, July 31. 1719.)

‡ "S. M. Danoise qui n'a pas un ducat pour défrayer ses besoins, est il encore capable de refuser de bonnes sommes? Si on aug-



Powers leagued against Sweden, none except the Czar remained in arms.

It is not to be supposed that these negotiations, either with Spain or Sweden, were carried on without frequent rubs and jars from the Hanoverian faction. A letter of Craggs at this period lifts up a corner of the veil which the loyalty of the Ministers hung over the frailties of the favourites. He inveighs most severely against the undue power and selfish views of Bernsdorf, and the extreme rapacity of all the Germans. "It is incredible," he adds, "what prejudice all these sales of offices do to the King's service; for, to complete our misfortunes, I have remarked that there is no distinction of persons or circumstances — Jacobites, Tories, Papists, at the Exchange or in the Church, by land or by sea, during the Session or in the Recess; nothing is objected to, provided there is money. . . . You see that at the rate we are now going on, Lord Stanhope is on the point of resigning every day. It is possible that his friends may continue in out of pure respect to the King, but without hoping to do the least good."\* There is certainly much passion and exaggeration in this picture; but still Lord Chesterfield's bitter sarcasm was not quite without some pretext, when he said some years afterwards, "If we have a mind effectually to prevent the Pretender from ever obtaining this crown, we should make him Elector of Hanover, for the people of England will never fetch another King from thence!"†

King George arrived in London from his German states on the 14th of November, and opened Parliament in person nine days afterwards. The first and most important measure of the Session was the celebrated Peerage Bill, which had already been brought forward in the previous winter; but which I have not noticed till now, in order to present a more clear and connected account of it.

The creation of twelve Peers to establish a majority for the Court had been justly reprobated in Lord Oxford's administration, and had formed an article in his impeach-

"*mente la dose je ne le croirai jamais!*" (Craggs to Schaub Oct. 13. 1719. Hardwicke Papers, vol. xxxvii.)

\* Secretary Craggs to Mr. Schaub, June 30. 1719. Appendix.

† H. Walpole's Letters to Sir H. Mann, December 9. 1742.

ment. The punishment of the wrongdoer might be sufficient to satisfy the multitude; but reflecting men would naturally consider whether any means existed to prevent the recurrence of the wrong, or whether the danger might not be more tolerable than the remedy. It was the remembrance of that outrage which first gave rise to the project of limiting the King's prerogative in the creation of Peers. But this, like other projects for the improvement of the constitution might have remained dormant for a considerable time, had it not been quickened by the personal difficulties and fears of Ministers. The German favourites, hungering for titles and honours, were constantly pressing to repeal the limitations of the Act of Settlement; and a restraint upon new creations of Peers would have been very useful as a further and final barrier against their selfish ambition. A still more powerful motive was supplied by the unhappy division in the Royal Family. The exasperation of the Prince of Wales, and some incautious expressions ascribed to him, made Stanhope and Sunderland apprehend his measures on coming to the throne; and Sunderland did not hesitate to tell Lord Midleton, the Chancellor of Ireland, when attempting to persuade him, that "ridiculous not to say "mad things would be done in case of a certain event."\* Nor was it expected that the measure would encounter any very formidable opposition. The King was easily induced, by jealousy of his son, and the total absence of any arbitrary views on his own part, to consent to relinquish this great branch of the Royal prerogative; in fact, he gave the measure not merely his cold consent, but his hearty concurrence. The Lords, it was thought, would readily pass a measure which so highly raised their individual importance. In the Commons the Tories would no doubt oppose it; but the Whigs had a vast majority; and the chief members of that party, whether in office or in opposition, had repeatedly inveighed against the unconstitutional measure of Lord Oxford, and urged that the Crown ought in future to be debarred from a prerogative which had once so seriously endangered the liberties, not only of England, but of Europe. It was

\* Lord Midleton's Minutes, Coxe's Walpole.

therefore with no unreasonable confidence of victory, that the measure was proposed.

On the 28th of February the Duke of Somerset, the first Protestant Peer, called the attention of the House of Lords to this subject, and gave the first idea of the intended Bill. He was seconded by the Duke of Argyle, and opposed by the Earl of Oxford. Two days afterwards Lord Stanhope brought down a Message from the King, that "His Majesty had so much at heart the settling the Peerage of the whole kingdom upon such a foundation as may secure the freedom and constitution of Parliament in all future ages, that he is willing his prerogative stand not in the way of so great and necessary a work." Accordingly on the 3d of March, the Lords, in a Committee of the whole House, discussed eleven Resolutions, which were proposed as the groundwork of the future Bill. By these it was provided, that the English Peers should not be increased beyond six of their present number, with an exception in favour of Princes of the Blood; that for every extinction there might be a new creation; that no peerages should hereafter be granted for any longer tenure than to the grantee, and to the heirs male of his body; that instead of the sixteen elective Peers from Scotland, the King should name twenty-five as hereditary from that part of the kingdom; and that this number, on the failure of heirs male, should be supplied from the remaining Scottish Peers.

It is remarkable, that the debate which arose upon this plan seems to have turned exclusively upon the Scottish portion of it. Lord Cowper forcibly argued that "what was intended to be done with relation to the Scottish Peerage was a manifest violation of the Treaty of Union, and the highest piece of injustice; and that the Scottish Peers who should be excluded from the number of the twenty-five hereditary would be in a worse condition than any other subject, since they would be neither representing nor represented." On the other part, it was maintained by the Dukes of Roxburgh and Montrose, "that the settling the Peerage in the manner proposed was rather a benefit than a disadvantage to the Scottish Peerage, whose representatives were

"thereby increased by nine; and as for those Peers who, "for the present, would be excluded, they would afterwards have a chance to come in upon failure of any of "the twenty-five." Lord Townshend, the leader of the Whigs in opposition, and Lord Nottingham, who guided a small section of the Tories, both declared that they were not against limiting the Peerage, but only against the doing it in a manner which, in their opinion, was unjust; and in fact, it may be observed, that the Scottish clauses were by no means required for the general object of the Bill. On a division, however, the entire Resolutions were carried by 83 votes against 30.

A Bill on these principles was accordingly brought in, and it passed through most of its stages without further opposition. But a considerable ferment had meanwhile arisen out of doors; and on the 14th of April, the day appointed for the third reading, Stanhope declared, "that "this Bill had made a great noise and raised strange apprehensions; and since the design of it had been so "misrepresented, and so misunderstood that it was likely "to meet with great opposition in the other House, "he thought it advisable to let that matter lie still till "a more proper opportunity." The Bill was accordingly dropped for that Session, with the declared purpose of reviving it in the next.

During this interval it may well be supposed that neither the friends nor the adversaries of the Bill were idle. An eager war of pens had already begun. One of the pamphlets against the measure was written by Walpole; but the palms of this political controversy were undoubtedly borne away by Addison on the one side, and by Steele on the other. Addison supported the Bill in a paper called "The Old Whig;" a powerful argument, and his last dying effort, for he expired not many weeks afterwards. He was ably answered by Steele, under the name of the "Plebeian;" Addison rejoined; and it is painful to find that these two accomplished friends, after such long and cordial intimacy, should not only be estranged in sentiment, but indulge in personal reflections on each other. It was the object of the Old Whig to show that in ancient times no such unlimited prerogative of creating Peers had been vested in the Crown—

that the abuse of that prerogative in the late reign called aloud for its limitation — and that the Commons would be more truly independent, and less liable to corrupt influence, when the Crown could no longer hold out to their chief members a prospect of hereditary honours. On the other hand, the Plebeian proved that the Bill tended to establish an unmitigated aristocracy, and pointed out the evils attendant on that form of government. The subject appears of so much Constitutional importance, that the reader will perhaps forgive me for offering some thoughts both on the question itself, and on the true principle and object of the Peerage.

Even in very early stages of society, the evils of pure despotism and of pure democracy were severely felt, and found to be nearly akin. The same violent bursts of passion, the same sudden changes of purpose, and the same blind fondness for favourites, which are the vices of a single tyrant, were seen no less to prevail in the assemblies of the sovereign people. “When once democracy,” says Thucydides, “became unrestrained at Athens, rival statesmen applied themselves only to please the multitude, and let go the care of the commonwealth.”\* In absolute monarchies, likewise, men looked rather to the favour of the sovereign than to the service of the state. In both cases, therefore, was felt the necessity of some check, and in both cases was soon established an assembly of chief men to take some part of the sovereign power, and to give moderation and steadiness to the government.

It is remarkable, however, that this institution has in different states proceeded on quite opposite principles. In free cities the original intention has been to give increased authority to old age. This idea will be found to run throughout, and the titles Gerontes, Senators, Patricians, Presbyters, Signori, Aldermen, have all the same primitive meaning. In early stages of society, when all men are equally uneducated, age and experience would of course possess much more value than when mental cultivation may sometimes raise a schoolboy of sixteen above a ploughman of sixty.

\* Hist. lib. ii. c. 65.



In conquered countries, on the other hand, the principal followers of the conqueror, dividing the lands amongst themselves or holding military fiefs for life, have commonly formed an assembly as a check upon absolute power. This assembly was composed, not on the principle of seniority or superior wisdom, but on the principle either of military courage or of a large stake in the commonwealth. Such was the case with most of the kingdoms that arose from the ruins of the Roman Empire; such was the case also with the Norman rulers of England.

But though these institutions have sprung from such opposite origins, it is very remarkable that they all have tended to the same result. Though neither the wisdom of age nor courage in the field have ever been thought hereditary qualities, yet the hereditary principle has nearly every where prevailed over the elective. The modes have indeed been very various. In many cases where the hereditary principle was not established by law, it has been adopted in practice. In many others it was favoured by the law of allowing the Senators to fill up their vacancies by officers (and such were the Roman Censors\*) of their own body. Sometimes a right of primogeniture has been acknowledged, sometimes there has been an equal enjoyment but a perpetual inalienability of the family estates. In England the elder son is usually expected to marry, in Venice it was the younger.† These, however, are only different means to a common end — the hereditary transmission of power.

The reason why this should be is apparent even from

\* “Les sénats républicains constitués avec la pensée toujours dominante de la perpétuité, ont en général été autorisés à se recruter eux-mêmes, tantôt par un scrutin entre tous les membres, tantôt par l’élection de quelques officiers tirés de leurs corps, tels que les Censeurs.” (Sismondi, de l’Elément Aristocratique.) Without plunging into that difficult and much debated subject, the admission into the Roman Senate, it is, however, quite certain, that the heads of the ancient families in every generation, always became members of that assembly.

† “On a remarqué que rarement les Venitiens élevaient à la dignité ducal un homme ayant encore sa femme. . . . De là, l’usage de ne marier ordinairement que les cadets dans les grandes maisons.” (Daru, Hist. de Venise, ch. xxxix. vol. vii. p. 267.)

so slight a sketch as I have given. If a Senate be intended as a check on Kings or on multitudes, it follows that to have all its members appointed either by the prerogative of the King or by the election of the multitude, is to recur to that very power which it was wished to control. It is to change the operation but not to diminish the force of a single or a many-headed tyranny. Thus therefore he who desires to see an Upper House chosen by the people or appointed by the Crown for life, seems to me utterly to mistake the true origin and object of the institution itself.

Of the practical value of this hereditary principle there was never, perhaps, a higher testimony nor a more striking illustration than that which was given, in his later days, by one of the great masters over mankind. "I have heard Napoleon," says M. de Sismondi, "observe during the Hundred Days, that government might be compared to sailing. It is necessary to have two elements before your ship can sail. You must, in like manner, have two elements before you can direct the vessel of the State, so that you may have a stay in the one against the other. You can never direct a balloon, because floating as it does in a single element you have no POINT D'APPUI to withstand the storms which agitate that element. Thus also there can be no POINT D'APPUI, no possibility of direction, in pure democracy; but when combined with aristocracy, you may work the one element against the other, and steer the vessel by their different powers."\*

Inheritance is therefore a fundamental and necessary principle of the Peerage. But it has, I conceive, another principle not less fundamental, — that this assembly should always be recruited by the most eminent warriors, statesmen, and lawyers of every age. It is this constant influx that keeps the current clear, and prevents it from degenerating into a torpid and stagnant pool. Without such accessions, I do not hesitate to say that

\* See a masterly essay by M. de Sismondi, "*Du Prince dans les Pays Libres*," published in the *Revue Mens. d'Econ. Polit.* October, 1834. I have also read with great pleasure and instruction his *Essay sur l'Elément Aristocratique*, in the same periodical, July and August, 1835. (These Essays and some others have since been published in a collective form, 1852.)

the House of Lords neither could nor should exist. The limitations proposed by Stanhope and Sunderland would, indeed, have increased the power and importance of the Lords for a season ; but would, most surely, by impairing their utility, have undermined their foundation and produced their downfall. The Peers, shut up in inaccessible dignity, would have learnt to look down on him whom even the highest services could not raise to an equality with themselves, unless by the previous extinction of one of their own number. The aspiring soldier or statesman would have lost one great motive for exertion. Even a Nelson could no longer have expected the same honours which had formerly rewarded an Anson or a Hawke. In many minds a sense of emulation would be altogether deadened. Many others (for such will always be the case with men of genius), finding that they could not rise to dignity by the institutions of the State, would attempt to rise over those institutions, and become noisy agitators instead of useful citizens. What has been the cause of the continued usefulness and authority of the British Peerage?—what has kept it firm and unshaken while so many neighbouring aristocracies have tottered to decay, or fallen before political convulsions? It is because their families are constantly coming from the people and returning to the people—they have been an institution, not a caste—not a separate and jealous oligarchy, like that of Venice, asserting for themselves and for all their descendants an inborn superiority over their brother men. With us, how many sons of ploughmen or of weavers, ennobled for their services, sit side by side with the loftiest of the Somersets and Howards! With us the younger children of the Peer return to the rank of Commoners, and his grandchildren merge again completely in the great body of the people. Such is the true principle of usefulness and vitality in the British Peerage ; and he who would limit its number, is as much its enemy and the country's, as he who endeavours to sap its hereditary honours.

It is true that the King's power of increasing the Peerage might be stretched to an unlimited extent, and for a factious purpose, so as utterly to overthrow the Constitution. But many other branches of the Royal prerogative

are, in like manner, liable to abuse and encroachment. Yet, we look upon the responsibility of Ministers as in almost every case a sufficient barrier; and in the opinion of one of our greatest Judges, "such public oppressions as tend to dissolve the Constitution are cases which the law will not, out of decency, suppose, being incapable of distrusting those whom it has invested with any part of the supreme power, since such distrust would render the exercise of that power precarious and impracticable."\* I may add, that while the advantages of the King's prerogative to create Peers are constant and unceasing, the danger of its abuse is extremely rare. During the peaceful reigns of the four Georges such an idea was never at any moment entertained by any statesman. It was reserved for the tumultuous times which preceded and which followed them. And on the whole, I would no more forego the benefits of the Royal prerogative from the possibility of its misuse than I would prohibit navigation to prevent the danger of shipwrecks!

For these reasons I believe that the Peerage Bill of 1719 was a narrow-minded, violent, and baneful measure, founded on mistaken principles, and tending to dangerous results. If it be asked on whom the blame of having planned it should mainly rest, it will be found stated by most of the later writers, such as Coxe†, that the measure was projected by Lord Sunderland. That statesman certainly pressed the Bill with great warmth, and had a stronger interest in it, since the animosity of the Prince of Wales was especially and personally levelled at himself amongst the Ministers. But on the other hand, I am bound not to omit that, in the debates of the House of Commons at the time, Lord Stanhope was attacked as the projector of the measure; and that amidst the unpopularity of the Bill, the charge was never denied by himself or by his friends.

If we next inquire to whom the praise of defeating this measure is most due, there can I think be no doubt that it belongs almost solely and exclusively to Walpole. We learn from Speaker Onslow, that when the Whigs in

\* Blackstone's Comment., book i. ch. vii. See also book iv. ch. ii. sect. 7.

† Memoirs of Walpole, vol. i. p. 116.

opposition held a meeting at Devonshire House during the recess to consider the course they should pursue upon this subject, the whole body appeared either favourable to the Bill or despairing of any successful opposition to it. Very many considered it as a sound Whig measure to restrain a prerogative against which they themselves had repeatedly inveighed, and protested that they could not with any show of decency oppose it. Lord Townshend himself had already in the House of Lords approved its principle, and several other Peers were not averse to the increased importance which it would confer upon themselves. On the whole, it was the general opinion of the meeting that the Bill should be permitted to pass without opposition. Walpole alone stood firm. He declared that this was the only point on which they could harass the Government with effect, and that he saw a spirit rising against it amongst the usual supporters of the administration, and especially the independent country gentlemen. One of these, he said, a member of the House of Commons, he had overheard declaring to another with many oaths, that though his estate was no more than 800*l.* a year, and though he had no pretension to the Peerage for himself, yet he would never consent to the injustice of a perpetual exclusion to his family. "Such a sentiment," added Walpole with his usual sagacity and foresight, "cannot fail to make its way. It will have a strong effect upon the whole body of country gentlemen; and for my part I am determined that if deserted by my party on this question, I will singly stand forth and oppose it." Walpole's declaration produced much altercation and resentment, and many attempts were made to shake his purpose; but finding him firm, his friends gradually came round to his opinion, and at length agreed to act with him as a body—to take no division on the Ministerial project in the Lords—but to resist it in the Commons.

At the opening of the Session on the 23d of November, the Peerage Bill was announced by the following expressions of the King's Speech:—"As I can truly affirm that no Prince was ever more zealous to increase his own authority than I am to perpetuate the liberty of my people, I hope you will think of all proper methods



“to establish and transmit to your posterity the freedom of our happy Constitution, and particularly to secure that part which is most liable to abuse. I value myself upon being the first who has given you an opportunity of doing it; and I must recommend to you to complete those measures which remained imperfect the last Session.” Two days afterwards the Bill was brought forward in the Lords by the Duke of Buckingham, to whom it had been intrusted by the Government, probably because the Duke being a vehement Tory, his support might be expected to gain some votes from that party in the House of Commons. The measure was the same as that proposed last Session; but in order to conciliate the Commons, the Ministers engaged to their friends that in case of the Bill passing the Lords would consent to part with their privilege of *SCANDALUM MAGNATUM*, and permit the Commons to administer an oath, and that the King would give up the prerogative of pardoning after an impeachment—“mere trifles,” observes Mr. Hallam, “in comparison with the innovation projected.”\*

According to previous arrangement, the Peerage Bill appears to have encountered no opposition in the Lords (except a speech from Earl Cowper), and it passed through all its stages in a very few days. But far different was its reception in the Commons. On the 8th of December, it having been read a second time, the debate was taken on the question, “That this Bill be committed.” The fate of the British Constitution seemed to hang suspended in the balance. On the Ministerial side, the chief speeches were those of Craggs, Lechmere, and Aislalie; and though scarcely any particulars are preserved of them, we find them called by high authority “very able performances.”† Amongst the adversaries of the Bill, the ingenuity and talent of Steele were as powerfully shown, and more fully reported. But by far the most splendid speech on that occasion was that of Walpole; and it may, in fact, be doubted if any harangue of so much eloquence and effect

\* *Constit. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 322. For the inducement held out by Ministers, see Lord Midleton's *Minutes*, Coxe's *Walpole*, vol. ii. p. 172.

† *Speaker Onslow's Remarks.*

had ever yet been delivered in the House of Commons; whether we judge of it by the impression which we are told it produced, or by that which the records of it make upon ourselves.\* He began with great spirit: "That the usual path to the temple of honour had been through the temple of virtue; but, by this Bill, it was now to be only through the sepulchre of a dead ancestor." He inveighed against Stanhope, "who," he said, "having got into the House of Peers, is now desirous to shut the door after him;" he touched with infinite caution and address on the unhappy breach in the Royal family; he drew a striking picture of the evils and injustice of the Scottish clauses of the Bill. In his skilful hands an argument was derived even from his own party tactics, that no division should be taken in the other House; "for surely," he urged, "the great unanimity with which this Bill has passed the Lords ought to inspire some jealousy in the Commons." On the dangers to the Constitution and to freedom he enlarged with all the eloquence of truth: "That this Bill will secure the liberty of Parliament I totally deny; it will only secure a great preponderance to the Peers, and form them into a compact impenetrable phalanx."—"In this strain," says Speaker Onslow, "he bore down every thing before him." The effect was apparent in the triumphant result of the division, when the Ministers had only 177 votes and the Opposition 269. I ought not to omit that very many of those whose personal interest was supposed to be promoted by this Bill did not hesitate to vote against it, and that the majority comprised the heirs of not a few such families as Compton, Devereux, and Willoughby. To signalise their victory, the prevailing party immediately moved "That this Bill be rejected," which they carried without resistance.

It is very remarkable that so signal and thorough a defeat of Ministers does not appear to have loosened their hold of office, nor lost them a general majority in the House of Commons. I cannot discover that their Parliamentary power afterwards was at all less sure and

\* Walpole's reported speech was in great measure compiled from his own memoranda (Coxe's Walpole, vol. i. p. 125.). The same, I suspect, was also the case with Steele's.

steady than before. So hopeless, indeed, seemed the prospect of overthrowing them that, as we shall find, Walpole, a few months afterwards, consented to accept a subordinate office under them, and became Paymaster of the Forces, while he prevailed upon Townshend to be named President of the Council. The Ministers, on their part, were of course no less rejoiced than strengthened by the accession of a statesman so far superior to any member of the House of Commons previously amongst them. But it appears that Stanhope and Sunderland had by no means relinquished their darling project of the Peerage Bill; that they intended to revive it at a more favourable opportunity; and that Walpole, on accepting office, was induced to relax his opposition to it. This is shown by the following passage in a letter from Craggs to Stanhope at Hanover:—"Mr. Walpole goes "into Norfolk next week for the summer. He was very "explicit to me two days ago about the Scottish part of "the Peerage Bill, which he will be for."\* It seems then that the Scottish clauses, against which Walpole had inveighed so eloquently in December, 1719, were secure of his support in July, 1720, and that he had unworthily bartered his principles for power. He might perhaps have continued more steady in opposing the other parts of the measure; but still I am of opinion, that had not the South Sea disaster intervened, and the deaths of Stanhope and Sunderland so speedily followed in succession, the Peerage Bill, no doubt with some changes and modifications, but still with the same pernicious tendency, would have been again brought forward by the Government. In such a case I hope, however, that it would have been again rejected by the independent spirit of the House of Commons.

\* Cockpit, July 22. 1720. Stanhope Papers, and Coxe's MSS.

## APPENDIX.





# EXTRACTS

FROM

## THE STUART PAPERS.

---

THE Stuart papers are now deposited at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor. Previous to 1717 there are comparatively few, but in that year there begins a regular and voluminous series of letters, according to their dates. There is also a large mass of papers, thrown together without any arrangement at all. In fact, the whole collection is now in very great disorder, and therefore much less available for historical research. I looked in vain for the important letter of Lord Oxford in September, 1716, which was seen by Sir James Mackintosh at Carlton House; nor could I find a very curious document, which is mentioned in the minutes of the Commissioners, as having been laid before them; it was in the hand-writing of Charles Edward, and declared that he had secretly come to London in 1750, and there renounced the Roman Catholic religion.

In justice to Mr. Glover, His Majesty's private librarian, to whose courtesy and attention I was much indebted during my researches, I am bound to add that the present disorder of the papers is not at all, I believe, owing to his fault: they are precisely in the same state as when they were first delivered over to his charge.

These papers contain some very important documents, and much rubbish. Amongst the latter I may mention a prodigious number of old bills of fare! Take the following as a specimen:—

## SOUPER DU ROL

10 *Sept.* 1733.

Un potage.  
 Une fricassée de pigeons.  
 Un ragoût de pieds de veau.  
 Mouton rôti.  
 Un chapon, deux pigeons.  
 Une tourte.  
 Un flan.  
 S.A.R.\*; un potage, un poulet gras  
 M. le Duc†, un potage, deux *Écossaises*.

(Signed) BOULÉON.

The two that follow I picked out from a large heap of papers in Charles Edward's possession:—

“A summary view of the prophecies of Nixon, Shipton, and Nostradamus, to be yet accomplished;” — the first being, “The Kings of Pr. and Sw. will at last prevail upon Fr. to assist the P.” (Prince.)

“List of men supposed loyal and rich, chiefly in London.”

The names in the list are such as these:—

“Wm. Birch, Druggist.

“Tim. Mathews, Confectioner, Watling Street,”  
 &c. &c.

From these papers I shall now proceed to give such extracts as may serve to confirm or elucidate my narrative.

*January*, 1836.

M.

Since the first edition of this History, the Stuart Papers have been removed from Cumberland Lodge. They have been in part arranged by the care of Mr. Glover, and are now deposited in the Library of Windsor Castle.

1852.

M.

\* Charles Edward.

† Cardinal York.

## DUKE OF BERWICK'S LETTERS TO THE PRETENDER.

*(Extracts.)**St. Germain's, Oct. 26. 1712.*

I WAS yesterday at Versailles, where I dined with M. de Torcy, with whom I had no long conversation, by reason that there was *conseil de dépêches* immediately after dinner, and the public ministers had had their audiences in the morning. However, by the short discourse, I found he was of opinion the English Ministry would not open itself more clearly at present, but that he had written to Abbé Gaultier to let him know your Majesty's just apprehensions, in order to see what effect it would have. He also told me that St. John had opened himself to the Abbé, and desired to know what Whigs had been in correspondence with your Majesty, that matters might be concerted accordingly. Your Majesty's answer to M. de Torcy upon that point was very generous and just, and ought to have a good effect with the present Ministry, who by that will see that they run no risk in trusting your Majesty.

*St. Germain's, Nov. 4. 1712.*

M. DE TORCY told me two days ago, at Versailles, that Mr. Harley had writ him word that your Majesty had sent lately into England some pickles, whose behaviour very much embarrassed the government. I told him that I believed it was a mistake, but that you were not master of all the Jacobites' actions and discourses, which very often were indiscreet: he told me he would write to your Majesty of it.

*May 12. 1713.*

ABBÉ GAULTIER is arrived . . . . . He assures me that M. Oleron (Oxford) has a great mind to serve M. Raucourt (James), and will do it effectually, as soon as Mr. Porray (the Peace) has had a little time to settle his concerns with Mrs. Alençon (England); and that there may be no mistakes on either side, he does intend to send an attorney (envoy) to M. Raucourt (James), to stay with

him till this affair be settled. But he still desires that it may be imparted to nobody alive, by reason of Mr. Walker (the Whigs) and Mr. Horne (Hanover).

He also says that the ablest physicians advise Mr. Robinson (James) to take the air in the fine season, for it will both divert him and hinder the ill humours gathering, which would quite ruin his health. Mr. Allain's country house (Germany) is very pleasantly situated, and the air is good, but he had better take into his company, before he parts, Mr. Soulegne (Security), who, it is hoped, will soon arrive from Valmont (Utrecht).

*May 23. 1713.*

J'AI fort pressé M. Waters (Gaultier) de savoir ce que M. Oleron (Oxford) conseillera à ses Messieurs de faire en cas que M. Albert (Anne) vient à faire banqueroute, avant que d'avoir réglé ses comptes avec M. Romain (the restoration of James); il m'a assuré qu'il était dans les meilleures dispositions du monde de leur rendre service, et que M. de Sablé (Bolingbroke) était aussi de concert avec lui pour seconder l'intention où est Albert (Anne) de payer ses dettes, mais que véritablement on ne lui avait point donné d'instructions en ce cas-là; qu'il lui paraissait si raisonnable de décider quelque chose sur cela, qu'il presserait Messrs. Oleron et Sablé (Oxford and Bolingbroke) de le faire, dès qu'il aurait été rendre visite à M. Alençon (England), auprès de qui il se doit rendre incessamment. Que jusqu'à M. Porray (the Peace) fut arrivé chez lui, il n'était pas possible que l'on put traiter à fond, mais que présentement M. Porray (the Peace) étant arrivé, on allait travailler sérieusement sur les affaires de M. Romain (the restoration of James).

*Fitzjames, July 31. 1713.*

THE chief point is to get Oleron (Oxford) to speak plain, and go now heartily and quickly to work, for fear of M. Albert's (Anne's) breaking before he pays his debts . . . . . I hear M. Sablé (Bolingbroke) and Oleron have been of late a little cold, but I hope and believe their common interest will make up all again.

*Fitzjames, Aug. 22. 1713.*

I AM sorry Mr. Lesley\* has begun with speaking to your Majesty about religion, but I hope that after the first attempt he will give it over, though it had been better he had never opened his mouth on that chapter.

*St. Germain's, Aug. 18. 1713.*

THE chief point will be to persuade M. Albert (Queen Anne); though really, if these gentlemen mean honestly, they ought, in my opinion, to take hold of the overture made, or find out some other. It is long and hard to put in a letter the whole proposition, but this is the substance: That M. Raucourt (James) should appear with M. Albert the very day of M. Puisieux's arrival (meeting of parliament) and that M. Albert should give M. Cassel (House of Lords) and Canaple (House of Commons) jointly an account of his agreement with M. Raucourt, and desire both their concurrence in the matter. I believe it would be such a surprise that neither of these two gentlemen would say no, and I make no doubt but M. Arthur (the English), who is naturally very fickle, would immediately give into it with as much joy as he has formerly shown on the like occasions; besides that M. Raucourt's being seen with M. Albert, will quite determine the matter. Mr. Belley told me a great many reasons, too long for a letter; but this seems to me an easier way of bringing the matter about than going to law with Horne (the Elector), or cringing to gain M. Puisieux (the Parliament), who is often out of humour, and hard to be brought to a right temper.

*St. Germain's, Feb. 4. 1714.*

M. ORBEC (Ormond) has had a long conversation with M. Oleron (Oxford); but this latter never would come to a determination, though pressed very home by the other. He is a man so dark and incomprehensible, that one is often tempted to believe him a knave at the bottom, were it not that Mr. Walker (the Whigs), Horne (the Elector), and Malbranch (Marlborough) will never make up with him.

\* James's Protestant Chaplain, a pious and worthy man. It appears that the Pretender would not even hear any argument in favour of the Church of England.



*St. Germain's, March 11. 1714.*

MR. BELLEY has had a letter from Mr. Malbranch's friend (Marlborough) at Mr. Foster's house. I will send your Majesty, on Tuesday, the originals, though you will find little more than *verba et voces*, according to that gentleman's usual custom.

*St. Germain's, March 28. 1714.*

M. DE TORCY sends your Majesty the letters he has received from England: they run on still in the same style about the religion, but that confirms me in the opinion that no answer is ever to be made on that subject. Truly, all this looks ill; for after two or three years' negotiation, to propose at last an impossible thing, is what we call *une querelle d'Allemand*: however, we must keep fair with them, for there is no remedy; but one must, at the same time, endeavour to get other friends to work, who will not speak of unreasonable, as well as impracticable, conditions.

*St. Germain's, April 20. 1714.*

M. ORBEC (Ormond) has at last spoken plain to M. Albert (Anne), and they are both agreed to bestir themselves in behalf of M. Raucourt (James).

*St. Germain's, May 6. 1714.*

M. TALON (Torcy) has had letters from Jearnot (Iberville) and Waters (Gaultier), which he intends to send unto M. Raucourt (James) by a messenger on purpose; so I shall only hint here, that for all M. Waters (Gaultier) formerly assured Oleron (Oxford) and Sablé (Bolingbroke) would never hearken, unless Raucourt (James) made up with Roland (became a Protestant), he now writes word that both these gentlemen have assured him that after Albert (Anne), they will never serve nor have any other master but Mr. Robinson (James).

*St. Germain's, May 11. 1714.*

M. ORBEC (Ormond) continues in his good intentions for M. Raucourt (James), but he enters not into any particulars how he will render him service. Something was said of M. Roland (becoming a Protestant), but he seemed not peevish upon the matter. Mr. Robinson's (James's)

affairs do not seem at present very current, but yet, when one puts all together, I think they have a better prospect, provided M. Albert (Anne) does not leave him too soon in the lurch.

*Camp before Barcelona, August 28. 1714.*

I HAVE been mightily concerned to hear the Princess of Denmark (Queen Anne) is fallen into an apoplexy, and I am in the greatest impatience to learn if she be recovered, for I fear your Majesty's measures cannot be ready, and I very much fear Hanover, the Whigs, Lord Churchill (the Duke of Marlborough), and the Treasurer, have taken their measures. One would even think that the fit of apoplexy is not natural; for, a little before, Lord Churchill and Bothmar arrive in England. The Treasurer is as great a villain as Lord Sunderland was.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*Paris, July 23. 1715.*

SIR,

YOUR servants at this place judging it impossible, by letter, to set matters in so full and just a light before your eyes as the nicety and importance of the present conjuncture require, the bearer of these packets has the honour to attend your Majesty.

I think it, however, my duty to make a deduction of what has past since my arrival here; to point out to your Majesty the mischiefs, and the causes of them, which your service labours under; and the remedies which appear necessary, and in your power to take.

The day I arrived I saw Mr. In(nes), and put into his hands all that you had been pleased to entrust me with. I soon found a general expectation gone abroad that your Majesty was to undertake somewhat immediately; and I was not a little concerned to hear, in two or three places, and among women over their tea, that arms were provided and ships got ready; but I confess I was struck with concern when I knew in such a manner as is to be depended upon, and as I beg your Majesty to depend upon, that the

factor of Lawrence (King George) in this country knew of the little armament, and had sent advices of it home; that the Court in Maryland (England) were in the resolution of conniving till the enterprise should be gone upon, and made no doubt, by this means, of crushing the whole at once; that ships are cruising on the coast, and that they are under private orders to observe, and even to search, when that shall appear necessary, all vessels which pass.

I was preparing on Sunday to send your Majesty these accounts, and to despatch Mr. Buck, when Mr. In(nes), came to me, and brought with him a man who had delivered your Majesty's letter to him, and the note you was pleased to write to me. Mr. In(nes) told me at the same time, that though he was referred by you, Sir, to this person for the particulars of the message which he brought, yet that he could get nothing distinct nor material out of him; that he seemed very unwilling to come to me, but that he had obliged him to it, and hoped I should be better informed by him.

This proceeding, as well as the man's character — for Mr. In(nes) told me he was an Irish friar — did not prepossess me much in his favour, or bring me to think our friends would be mad enough to trust him; but that I might neglect nothing which could in any way relate to your service, I resolved to see him. He staid with me near an hour; I heard him with all the patience possible, and asked him several leading questions, but could get nothing out of him, except his having seen Charles (Ormond), more than what the Dutch gazettes and the flying post inform us of every week. He seemed very eager to get something out of me, asked me not a few impertinent questions, and had the impudence to tell me that he met me on the road from Bar; which could not be true, according to his own account: in a word, I caught him in several contradictions, and can make no other judgment but this, in which your servants here all agree with me, that if he is not a spy, he is at best one of those little fellows who thrust themselves into business, and who, without having merit to be entrusted, or capacity to inform, think to supply both by being forward and impudent.

I dined with Monsieur de 24, 19, 22, 8, 27 (Torcy) yesterday, and gave him an account of this incident, of your last resolutions, and of what I heard from Martha (England), which agrees with his accounts. He does himself the honour to write to you, and your Majesty will see, by what he writes, that it is impossible the message which the friar pretends to bring from Charles should be true, Charles (Ormond) having, to the person who belongs to Harry (King of France) in Margaret's country (England), given a different answer, and mentioned another time.

Upon all this I beg your Majesty to reflect, as well as upon what I humbly offered to your consideration, when I attended you myself. It is evident, that in Margaret's country things are not ripe; that at least you cannot tell with certainty whether they are so or not; that the secret is divulged; that in the present method, the correspondence wants that preciseness and exactness which is indispensably necessary; and, lastly, that Harry (King of France) has not yet spoken clearly, whether he will not, in some manner or other, give a private assistance now, and perhaps a public one hereafter.

The first, second, and fourth of these reflections will be answered by sending the person intended to be sent with your first orders; and by continuing to employ such men as he, such as have capacity equal to the business, and to whose honour your own safety and that of so many persons as are concerned may be trusted.

The third of these reflections is to be answered by preparing at another place for the transportation of your person, whilst all the appearances continue as they are at the 13, 6, 25, 22, 10 (Havre), and as soon as Ralph (Berwick) arrives, measures shall be taken for this purpose.

When he arrives, we shall be able to speak with more certainty on the fifth head. I will not venture to advance too far, but I have much greater hopes from Harry (France) than you, Sir, seemed to entertain; and if you are well served, you will in my conscience meet with support.

As I have nothing before my eyes but a true zeal for your service, so, Sir, I hope you will please to accept of my faithful endeavours, and to excuse any error in my conduct from the sincerity of my intentions.

I neither subscribe, nor write in plain words, for greater security.

*Tuesday, 23d July, 1715.*

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*Paris, Aug. 3. 1715.*

It is matter of the greatest satisfaction to me to find that your Majesty is pleased to accept of my sincere endeavour to serve you. If I have any uneasiness, it is only on this account—that I am sensible my best services will fall infinitely short of those which so much grace and goodness deserve. Permit me to add these faint expressions of the sense I have of your Majesty's last favour to what I said in my letter writ this morning; and to assure your Majesty, that no heart can be more full of duty, of zeal, of gratitude.

As soon as the two gentlemen arrived, by whom I received the honour of your Majesty's of the 26th of last month, and the paper brought from Maryland (England), I writ to Monsieur Talon (Torcy) and enclosed the letter for him which came with a flying seal. He answered me the next day, expressed the satisfaction he had, added that Harry (King of France) was very much prepared to receive favourably what I should have to represent, and concluded by assuring me, *qu'on aura soin de faire préparer la voiture en lieu où elle ne donnera point de soupçon.*

My next care was to despatch 8, 6, 17, 10, 22, 19, 18, 10 (Cameron); 17, 25, 22, 22, 6, 27 (Murray) could not have gone without giving too much umbrage, because of his known habits and intimacy in Maryland. Besides which he is of indispensable and daily use here, and in the last place the former is better than any person acquainted in the place to which he is sent and will have the utmost credit with the people.

I judged this measure to be absolutely necessary, not only to prevent any mistake and precipitate measure, but also to keep up the spirit there, and to account for the delay here. He will be soon back again, and Charles (Ormond) shall have notice of his journey, so that he may be prepared to confer with him at his return.



After this Ralph (Berwick) came from the country on a letter which I writ to him, and we went over the whole contents of the papers brought, and every other point which our thoughts suggested to us. I think we concurred in our opinions on every head. The first steps we agreed to take was to show the Court of 11, 22, 6, 18, 8, 10 (France), how practicable, how morally certain, the enterprise would prove if it was avowed and supported with 11, 19, 22, 8, 10, 23 (forces); to insist therefore, in your name, and in the names of all those from whom I have authority to speak, and sure we deserve to be believed in a matter where we venture so deeply, that they should be granted, and in that case to answer for events, as far as in cases of this nature they can be answered for. After this conference Ralph returned home, and Talon came to town.

Talon takes so affectionate a part in every thing which relates to your Majesty's interest, talks so freely with me concerning the difficulties which arise here, and is so very frank in endeavouring to remove them, that I thought it best to consider with him, and to take his advice concerning the best use which we could make of these papers for your Majesty's service.

He desired he might be fully and particularly instructed in the whole state of the affair, and took upon him with these arms the proper efforts in the proper places; producing or concealing, as at different times and with different characters, would best conduce to the great end.

I have therefore sent in the papers whereof I enclose copies, and the person who is intrusted between him and me will explain and enforce the whole to him by word of mouth.

I dare not promise much; but this I may venture to say, that the people here endeavour to feel Margaret's (England's) pulse, and determine to guide themselves as that rises and falls. God forbid that your Majesty should neglect any favourable opportunity, or throw away any reasonable prospect which may offer themselves, in expectation of assistance from thence; or of any other circumstance whatsoever.

But till things are ripened in Maryland you cannot

answer to it yourself, to your faithful servants, to the present age, nor to posterity, if you act; and as those things ripen, these will ripen too. Forgive a freedom which proceeds from a warm zeal for your service, Sir, and a thorough conviction, that the preservation or eternal ruin of my country depends on the person and conduct of your Majesty.

Nothing farther can be said of 11, 22, 6, 18, 8, 10 (France), till I have some answer from Talon, which I expect about the middle of the week; and nothing farther can be said of Margaret till Bevil or some other person come from thence.

I am sorry Mr. Dicconson has yet no despatch from me, but I will not lose time on my part, and indeed a letter which I have just now seen from the water-side shows that no time is to be lost. The answer from Thomas (King of Sweden) is not yet come; we continue in hopes it will be favourable.

It is certain that the factor of Leonard deals with 19, 22, 16, 10, 6, 18, 23 (Orleans). They have had, I believe, very lately a private meeting. I gave notice in the proper place, and took care that it should get to the ears of Humphrey (Orleans).

The moment the gentleman who goes with my packets to Marly returns, I shall do myself the honour to write again.

I ask pardon if I have said too little or too much in any instance; for besides not being extremely well, I have been hurried with so much business, that I may easily have fallen into some mistake. I am, with all possible respect, &c.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Paris, Aug. 5. 1715.*

IMPATIENCE, Sir, in your circumstances, is unavoidable; and you would not be what you are, was you exempt from it. I wish to God the nature of the affairs we have in hand admitted of so swift a progress as to satisfy this

impatience ; but that is not to be expected. In the mean while I must be humbly of opinion that they improve every day ; and that the event of things will justify the advice given you from Margaret (England).

Delafaye is returned from Marly. Talon (Torcy) received the papers, reads them to-day with Harry, and makes me hope to receive on Wednesday, when he comes to town, something satisfactory. I shall not fail to despatch to you on Thursday.

I own to you, Sir, I look on the first part of the lady's letter to be the product of her own brain : was it otherwise, was the person she pretends to write from in the sentiments she expresses, he has, with great dexterity, brought himself into such circumstances, that I do not see the use he might be of to you. It is, however, certainly right to disgust nobody, to hear every thing, to receive every body, and to believe things and to trust persons with great caution.

It would be of mighty use if the alarm of your Majesty's design to embark this summer could be stifled. I take what measures I can for that purpose.

---

COPIE DE LA LETTRE DE MILORD BOLINGBROKE  
A. M. DE TORCY.

*Août, 1715.*

JE vous envoie, Monsieur, un mémoire qui vous mettra au fait de toutes nos affaires. Vous y verrez les sentimens de nos amis, très-naïvement exprimés, aussi-bien que leurs résolutions. Ce ne sont pas les sentimens de deux ou trois particuliers ; ce ne sont pas des opinions données à la hâte ; ce ne sont pas des résolutions inspirées par la seule passion, et capables par conséquent de se dissiper aussi légèrement. Ce sont, au contraire, les sentimens des meilleurs cœurs et des meilleures têtes du pays d'où ce mémoire vient ; fondés sur des observations certaines, et sur des avis surs de toutes les provinces du royaume. Ce sont des opinions prises avec flegme, après une mûre délibération ; ce sont des résolutions de gens d'honneur, les caractères desquels répondront assez d'eux, comme il

est assez connu qu'ils sont en état de répondre de tout ce parti qui se distingue par le nom de Toris.

Vous ne seriez pas peu fâché de voir échouer une entreprise, la ruine de laquelle entraînera celle de tout ce que la France a d'amis en Angleterre, et livrera ce pays à jamais entre les mains de vos plus cruels ennemis.

Il ne tient qu'au Roi d'en assurer le succès. J'ose dire qu'il lui sera plus facile de rétablir le fils, qu'il n'était aux États d'Hollande de détrôner le père.

Je ne prétends pas entrer en des raisonnemens pour montrer combien il s'agit ou de la gloire de sa Majesté ou de l'intérêt de la France, dans cette affaire. Vous savez et l'un et l'autre mieux que moi. Il me suffira de vous dire que si le Roi veut songer au rétablissement du Chevalier, Dieu lui en a donné les moyens, en formant la conjoncture la plus heureuse qui fut jamais ; que tout est prêt chez nous ; que je me fais fort d'en concerter les mesures, sur vos ordres, avec les Seigneurs et Gentilshommes qui sont dans le secret, et que vous trouverez en eux toute la docilité et toute la fermeté nécessaires.

J'ai mandé au Chevalier qu'il pouvait compter sur la voiture ; mais je vois par ce qu'il me fait l'honneur de me mander, et par ce qu'on m'écrit de Rouen, que sans quelque secours d'argent immédiat il ne sera pas en état de soutenir les frais journaliers des vaisseaux qui sont au Havre, et qu'il est d'une nécessité absolue d'y faire continuer, ne fut-il que pour mieux cacher le véritable endroit de son embarquement.

Monsieur De la Faye aura la bonté de vous remettre ce paquet : il m'a aidé dans le travail que j'ai eu ; il est fort au fait de ces choses, et vous pourra expliquer des articles que vous ne trouverez pas peut-être assez détaillés.

Je suis, &c.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Paris, August 15. 1715.*

HARRY (King Louis) has writ to his grandson (King of Spain) with his own hand, to press him to supply your

Majesty with that money which he would furnish himself, was he able to do it; and we hope, I think with reason, that the money may be obtained. The grandson has actually 100,000 crowns in this city, and the last advices from his country say that the rich merchant ships were daily expected. His factor here embraces the matter very heartily, and I believe we shall succeed.

Charles (Ormond) is negotiating a loan in this city from private persons of 500,000 livres; and I beg to refer your Majesty to him for an account of the progress he has made, and of the hopes he entertains.

This morning I have seen Thomas's factor (the ambassador of the king of Sweden). He assures me his master is determined to furnish you with the 24, 22, 19, 19, 20, 23 (troops); but we are under apprehensions that the packet sent to press the immediate despatch of them has not got to the place where Thomas now is.

If we do not hear this week that those letters are come to hand, a gentleman will be sent from hence on Monday, with duplicates of them, and with such farther instances and advices as are necessary.

Charles has had some distant overtures made to him from Harry's nephew (Duke of Orleans). He answered civilly, but avoided any particulars. On this head I must acquaint your Majesty with an accident that has happened, on which I lay some weight, and which I will improve or not, as you shall please to direct. I have been in commerce with a woman for some time, who has as much ambition and cunning as any woman I ever knew — perhaps as any man. Since my return to Paris she has, under pretence of personal concern for me, frequently endeavoured to sound how far I was engaged in your service, and whether any enterprise was on foot.

Your Majesty easily imagines that the answers I gave her were calculated to make her believe, that neither I nor any one else thought at present of any such design. A few days ago she returned to the charge, with all the dexterity possible, and made use of all the advantages which her sex gives her. I took that occasion to pretend to open my heart entirely to her, and according to what I writ your Majesty word I had concerted with Talon, to insinuate the impossibility of attempting any thing for



your service. She entered upon this into the present state of affairs, in a manner that I could see was pre-meditated; agreed that, in consideration of Harry's age and health, no vigorous resolution could be expected here; but added, that Harry's nephew, when he was once confirmed in the 22, 10, 12, 10, 18, 8, 27 (regency), would undoubtedly be ready to concur in so great an undertaking, and that she did not see why a marriage between you and one of his daughters might not be an additional motive to him, and a tie of union between you. I received the proposal merrily, as a sally of her imagination, and as such she let it pass. But there must be more in it, because of her character, because of the intimacy she has had with 19, 22, 16, 10, 6, 18, 23 (Orleans), and because of the private but strict commerce which I know she keeps up with one of his confidants, and the influence she has over that man.

It is extremely nice and difficult to manage this affair, since particular engagements of this kind might in many respects do hurt both here and in Maryland (England), might prejudice your affairs now, and embarrass you hereafter. And yet the advantage of gaining a man of that ambition, of those talents, and so nearly allied to power, deserves great consideration. Your Majesty will excuse this detail, if you judge it impertinent, and you will give me your orders, if you think any use may be made of such an intrigue. I would have even the pleasures and amusements of my life subservient to your Majesty's service, as the labours of it shall be always.

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Paris, Aug. 19. 1715.*

A SECRETARY who belongs to me left London on Friday was seven night. . . . . This secretary has brought me large bundles of papers, which our friends send me as materials to prepare representations in opposition to what

is contained in the report of the Secret Committee. The work will be very tedious and difficult ; but since it is thought necessary to keep up the spirit of the people, and the reputation of that Ministry, I will lock myself up, and go through it in the best manner I am able.

What I had the honour to foretell you, Sir, proves true ; this spirit increases, and all the measures taken to extinguish the flame seem but as fresh fuel to make it burn higher. Things are hastening to that point, that either you, Sir, at the head of the Tories, must save the Church and Constitution of England or both must be irretrievably lost for ever.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*Paris, Aug. 20. 1715.*

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to send your Majesty two extracts of M. d'Iberville's letters, which I received from M. de Torcy, together with the copy of what I have writ this morning to that Minister.

The Duke of Ormond sends your Majesty, I suppose, the other advices from England. I think by those letters it is plain that Harry Campion is sent with some new resolution from your servants on that side of the water.

Your affairs hasten to their crisis ; and I hope that, with prudence and fortitude, for they must go hand in hand, your Majesty's restoration will be soon accomplished. Was the conjuncture here in any degree answerable to the conjuncture in England, you would neither have any risk to run, nor struggle to go through.

The Duke of Shrewsbury is frankly engaged, and was, the last time I heard of him, very sanguine. I submit to your Majesty whether a letter from yourself to him, or a message through me, would not be proper.

As to Peterborough, I think, indeed, he is not to be neglected. I will write to him, and even offer to meet him. Your Majesty knows his character, and will give me your orders how far he is to be promised. We have always lived together on a foot of intimacy, and perhaps I may

succeed to dip him. At present he endeavours, I perceive, to keep on the best side of the bay.

May I presume to ask whether something particular has been said to Marlborough? He is at this moment much perplexed, and openly pushed at. Should not the Duke of Berwick at least, by your Majesty's order in this point of time, endeavour to fix him? An application justly timed has always a double force.

I am, with the utmost respect, &c. &c.

I had forgot to add that any treaty with Mills (Marlborough) must be kept very secret from Charles (Ormond); for though nothing can cool the zeal of the latter, yet this might, perhaps, give him some little dissatisfaction at heart.

I should likewise add that the reports from Versailles, about the King's health, vary continually. I believe your Majesty must depend upon his life as very precarious.

---

JAMES TO THE DUKE OF BERWICK.

(*Extract.*)

*Aug. 23. 1715.*

I do not see why, when Raucourt (James) goes to Scotland, he might not write a letter to Malbranche (Marlborough), to require his attendance there or his declaring openly for him in England, for which an order would of necessity oblige Malbranche to pull off the mask and trim no longer.

I think it is now more than ever *Now or Never!*

J. R.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Sept. 3. 1715.*

I HAVE always found the Spaniards very alert on the trifles of ceremonial; and therefore they cease to be trifles when treating with them.

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO THE EARL OF MAR.

*Sept. 20. 1715.*

ANNEXED to this letter, which is only for your Lordship, and for such persons as you shall judge proper, is the substance of the memorials sent into England, of all which I hope care is taken by our friends there to communicate to you the contents, since in a conjuncture like this, no trouble, no expense, no risk is to be avoided, which are necessary to enable those who are embarked in the same cause to act in a perfect concert, the want whereof I never felt so much as of late.

There is likewise annexed the answer which the King gives to a question proposed to him by a man lately sent from Lord Drummond, and just now gone back with a verbal message. Since our friends thought it proper that I should openly appear in the King's interest, and that he thought it proper I should transact his business, I have not been idle; and if the French King had lived we should have obtained some assistance directly, much more indirectly, and a great many facilities by connivance, though even this was thought unattainable when I first came to Paris. But the case is altered; he is dead, and the Regent is in quite other dispositions. The prospect of opposition to his regency made him enter into engagements with Hanover, and the prospect of opposition to his seizing the Crown, in case of the young King's death, makes him adhere to those engagements.

I now most heartily wish that the King had gone away two months ago, with the few arms and little money which he then had. But your Lordship knows what instructions Charles Kinnaird brought.

That memorial was our Gospel; we kept it still in our eye; and before we could provide ourselves with a small part of what you and the rest of our friends asked even by the second proposition, which was a sort of a *pis aller*, this unhappy turn of affairs in France came upon us. I remind your Lordship of this, because I hear every day complaints from those who will judge of men's conduct without knowing their circumstances, and who are much more ready to find fault with others than to act themselves, against even the King himself, as if every thing

was ready for him, and as if the most favourable opportunity would be lost, purely by his unwillingness to venture over. I know you will do our master justice on this head; his friends in Scotland were ready; but his friends in England desired, besides succours of several kinds, a longer time to prepare. At the request of these, and much against his own inclination, he was prevailed upon to defer his embarkation, which is now grown difficult beyond expression.

You will hear from other hands that the English fleet has visited the French coast several times; that their cruisers are very alert in the Channel; and that within these four days Sir George Byng is come into the Road of Havre, and has demanded by name the ship on board which are some arms and stores. The Regent has, indeed, not thought fit to give them up; but he has sent down orders to unload them, and has promised that they shall not go out. After this I leave you to judge how easy it will be for the King to get off without the Regent's knowledge, and how safe for him with it. We are taking, however, measures to find a passage for him; and how hazardous soever the attempt may be, nothing but impossibilities will stop him. We hear that you are in arms, and you easily judge this motive sufficient to carry us to all that men can do. But we do not yet know, which is a most uncomfortable consideration, what our friends in England will resolve to do now Hanover has an army, more money, the Habeas Corpus Bill suspended, and a friend at the head of this government, who thought, before any of these cases happened, that the King's enterprise was not practicable, unless he brought a proportion of stores, arms, &c., which he is utterly unable to procure.

There comes by the same conveyance with this letter a commission in blank, but in the form which was desired when Charles Kinnaird came over. Your Lordship knows why it is not filled up as was once intended. The King leaves that to his friends to do, and he depends, in the management of this, and of all his interests, principally on your Lordship's zeal and capacity, as he has told you himself, and as he commands me to repeat to you.

There is another letter writ by Cameron to his brother, and the occasion of it is this. We have in a creek of the



river Seine a little ship, on board which are thirteen hundred and fifty arms, and four thousand weight of powder, nine barrels of balls, one hogshead of flints, and one mould.

We hope she will pass unheeded by the English or their new allies, the French; and she is ordered to proceed forthwith to the north-west coast of Scotland. I believe we shall find three or four good officers to send with her, and you shall have letters by them from me in this cipher.

The reason of sending her to the north-west coast is evident, and the same reason will hold, I believe, for the King.

You will, therefore, please to have that in your eye, that if he should come to some place above Dumbarton, a proper disposition may be in time made for his reception; for wherever he comes he will be almost literally alone. Should he be able to come to the other coast, we take the Earl Marshal's castle to be the place assigned. I cannot conclude this letter without summing up the present state of the King's affairs, according to the light I see them in, and without giving my opinion frankly and in confidence; for I write to a man of sense, a man of honour, and a friend. Instead of having a ship furnished by France for the King's transportation, which we had obtained, and which, I confess, I thought an article of the greatest importance, for reasons you will easily comprehend, the whole coast from Jutland to Spain is against us; and unless the King steals off unknown, which to me appears almost impossible, considering the extent of country he must traverse, and the vigilance which is used in every part of France, he will either be seized or betrayed. The troops we hoped for from Sweden are refused us, and the bills which were given for their embarkation are returned. The money we expected from Spain is, in my opinion, still in the clouds, and was it actually in our hands we should be at a loss how to get it on board. Instead of having the arms which were promised us by the late King, it is become doubtful whether we shall have it in our power to carry off those which we have of our own.

Instead of being sure that France would not see us run over by foreign forces, we are sure that from Holland

and Germany, Hanover will be at liberty to bring as many as he pleases. In a word, every resource has failed us, and every accident which we could apprehend has fallen out; so that against the whole weight of the Government, and Legislature of Britain, such as they are, against an army, a fleet, immense sums of money, and the most powerful foreign alliances, we have nothing to oppose but the good dispositions of the people of Britain; and we are not yet certain whether the good disposition of those in England will carry them to act in these circumstances.

I must therefore be of opinion, that a more fatal conjuncture can never happen, and that the attempt can probably end in nothing but the ruin of our cause for ever, of which you may observe that the Whigs are so sensible, that they precipitate, for this reason, their violent measures in order to oblige us to come to a decision at this time. On the other side, certain it is, that the face of things on this side of the water must change, for many reasons too long to recapitulate. But if our friends are not in a condition to wait, without submitting and giving up the cause entirely and for ever, desperate as I think the attempt is, it must be made; and dying for dying, it is better to die warm, and at once, of a fever, than to pine away with a consumption. These, my Lord, are the informations I had to give you, and these are the sentiments which, according to the best of my judgment, I form; and which, having a conveyancer that I hope will prove a safe one, I could not forbear to communicate to you. Whatever be the event of things, do me the justice to believe that you shall find a man of honour and a faithful friend, in your humble servant

BOLINGBROKE.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*Paris, Sept. 21. 1715.*

SIR,

I DELAYED till now despatching a messenger, the only safe way in the present circumstances of corresponding, to your Majesty, that I might be able to give you some

account of the steps taken in pursuance of your last orders.

At my return from Bar I found that Mr. Innes, and Captain O'Flanagan, had been consulted about providing a vessel for your Majesty's transportation on the western coast of France, but I found no one step made towards the execution of this project. I thought it was proper to begin by setting this matter in a method of being finished with as much secrecy as possible; and having consulted the Captain last mentioned, and Robert Arbuthnot, who is as sensible, as zealous, and as useful a servant as any you have, O'Flanagan is despatched to St. Malo's with a detail of instructions which I am well persuaded he will execute with judgment and fidelity, and, I hope, with success.

Sir Nicholas Girardin is the merchant whom we think to depend upon for fitting out the ship as intended to go to the Canaries, and we propose not to buy but to hire by the month and insure.

The Queen orders Mr. Innes to furnish some money to O'Flanagan, and by that means he will guess at the service intended, as well as by what was said to him before my return; but I shall say nothing to him nor any one else of the measure taken, because I know no better maxim in all business than that of trusting no creature with the least circumstance beyond what is absolutely necessary he should know, in order to enable him to execute his part of the service.

The Duke of Berwick is gone to St. Germain's, so that I shall have no opportunity of making either a secret or a confidence of this to him. I add no more as to his Grace, though I should have something to say, because the Queen tells me she has writ to your Majesty her opinion, in which I humbly concur.

There is another project on foot for your Majesty's going off, which has been debated by the Duke of Ormond, Arbuthnot, and myself, and which may perhaps be safer than any, should this Court prove as adverse to your interest as we apprehend, though it has a very romantic air. It is proposed that the runner prepared at the Havre to carry your Majesty, and bound in appearance for Gothenburg, should sail; that if she finds herself ex-

amined, pursued, and dogged, she should in effect repair to Gothenburg and lose her voyage; but that if she finds the sea clear, and herself unobserved, she should proceed to the mouth of the Texel, and come to anchor off the Fly, of which care will be taken to give your Majesty instantly notice.

It is proposed that your Majesty should in the deepest disguise, such for example as saved your uncle King Charles after the battle of Worcester, make the best of your way, with a merchant or some such unsuspected person whom the Duke of Lorraine would undoubtedly find for you, through Holland, embark on board this vessel, and by the shortest cut pass into Scotland.

But there is another employment for this very ship which occurs to my thoughts, and which may at the same time answer the view your Majesty did me the honour to communicate to me.

The Prince de Cellamar has told the Duke of Berwick that he cannot pay the money without the Regent's consent, as in the King's life he could not have paid it without his consent. I expected at last some evasion or other, and this is as gross an one as could be fallen upon. However, the ambassador has promised to write to Madrid for a revocation of these real or pretended orders, and to propose that the money may be lodged at Port-Passage, or some other haven in the north of Spain, and may be there taken up and transported directly to Scotland.

Now, Sir, should this method of sending the money be pushed as the Queen and Duke of Berwick hope, and as I confess I very much doubt, the runner designed for you, and which I mentioned above, might be the ship made use of, and your journey to Spain might be so timed as to meet her and so embark with the money.

I mention all that my own or other men's thoughts suggest, that in a matter of this consequence your Majesty may have before your eyes as many expedients as possible, and whatever you determine I will cheerfully and vigorously execute; but I must confess that the more I think, the more I hear, and the more I struggle forward in this business, the more impracticable it appears to me. Your Majesty will soon know the certainty of what is doing in Scotland, and of what may be expected from

England, and you will then weigh the hazard and difficulty of going in one scale, and the prospect of success on your arrival in the other.—Before I leave this head, I must add, that we hear the English squadron is returning from the Baltic, and that besides the ships cruising in the Channel, five men of war have their stations on the north-east coast of Scotland, from the Firth of Edinburgh to Inverness.

The next point to which I applied myself, was the despatch of one of the blank commissions to Scotland, and I thought it very necessary to send the substance of the two memorials transmitted to England some time ago, a copy of the message which Mr. Hamilton carries at this time to the same country, and the minutes which your Majesty gave me as your answer to the message last brought you from the Highland Lords, that so your friends and servants might see the progress of things, and the insuperable obstructions which have lain in your way, and be able to account for a delay which they seem to bear with so great impatience. To all this I have added a long letter to the Earl of Mar, a copy whereof and of Hamilton's message (for your Majesty is already apprised of the contents of the other papers), come inclosed, and will I hope have your gracious approbation. I take the liberty to speak of your Majesty's personal conduct, for the reason specified in my letters; and if I say any thing of myself, I hope your Majesty does me the justice to believe it is not through so contemptible a principle as vanity, but I thought it of use to let those who are parties to the same engagements as I am entered into, and at whose desire, according to what I told your Majesty when I attended you at Commercy, I took off the mask, know the manner in which I proceed, and by that the obligation of honour, even on this account, which they are under.

Your Majesty will hear from other hands of what has passed at the Havre; there are 1300 arms, 4000 weight of powder, and other stores, on board another ship which is not yet discovered. I intend to send her as I write to Lord Mar. The Duke of Ormond inclines rather to have her stay some time in expectation of hearing some good news from the west of England, and in that case of send-



ing her thither, in which case I agree with his Grace, that the arms would be better applied. But this is uncertain, and the longer she continues where she is, the greater risk we run of losing even the little she has on board. Upon the whole, if Arbuthnot finds he can keep her concealed, she may stay as my Lord Duke desires; if not, I think she should proceed on the first plan.

George (Bolingbroke) received on Tuesday night an answer from the person who spoke to Humphrey (Orleans), that he might have an 6, 25, 9, 14, 10, 18, 8, 10 (audience), and the answer was, that he could not do it; that those people had used him too well for him to take any measures against them; and that the secret could hardly be kept though he saw George in private.

I confess this answer surprised and piqued me, and I was not at all shy of showing myself to be so. The day before yesterday the gentleman who managed this affair came to me again, and told me that the eldest servant of Humphrey had expressed a wish to see George and converse with him, that he hinted as if his master would do the same, and yet he said in terms that 23, 24, 6, 14, 22 (Stair), imposed very much. What judgment to make of these uncertainties and awkward proceedings I know not. I shall speak very plainly, as I think I have a title to do from my share in the transactions of the four last years, and leave it to operate. After to-morrow George will probably have had his interview, and your Majesty shall have an account of it unless it pass entirely in compliment and banter.

I enclose to your Majesty two letters from Stralsund with great reluctance; since you will find by them that all our hopes of troops are vanished. I received them from the Queen, whose packet accompanies this, and who intends to send your Majesty's servant down to you.

I have nothing more to add but my excuses for the length of my letter, and assurances of being ever, &c.

---

## JAMES TO LORD BOLINGBROKE.

(Extract.)

Sept. 23. 1715.

THE message Cameron brought me gave me great uneasiness: but, I thank God, that account did not prove true, and since that is, I still hope our Scotch friends will, at least, wait for my answer, if they cannot stay so long as to expect a concert with England, which I begin to flatter myself they may.

On the whole, I must confess my affairs have a very melancholy prospect; every post almost brings some ill news or other; all hopes of the least foreign help are extinguished: instead of gaining new friends, we apprehend a powerful enemy; and all our endeavours and pains are in a manner lost, and it is all rowing against the tide. But yet this is so far from discouraging me, that it doth but confirm me in my opinion of a present undertaking; for I cannot but see, that affairs grow daily worse and worse by delays, and that, as the business is now more difficult than it was six months ago, so these difficulties will, in all human appearance, rather increase than diminish. Violent diseases must have violent remedies, and to use none has, in some cases, the same effect as to use bad ones.

I cannot but send you this bit of a *Lardon*, to show you how secrets are sometimes thought to be got out, when there is nothing but mere guess and conjecture in the case; as here the *Lardon* news is of the 10th, N. S., and I did not so much as see you, nor name Spain or Bayonne, till the 14th.

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

Paris, Sept. 25. 1715.

SIR,

I HAD yesterday the honour of your Majesty's letter of

the 23d. In making up the last packet, my secretary forgot the copy of the letter which I writ to the Earl of Mar, and which comes now enclosed.

I have seen letters which mention the rising of the Highlanders as general, which say that the Earl of Mar is at the head of them; that great numbers of Lords, and others from the Lowlands, are repaired to them; that the consternation at St. James's is great; that the stocks fell; that some troops are ordered to reinforce those already in Scotland; that they dare not send a greater number, because they expect another rising in London and in the West of England would happen if they did; that the dissatisfaction of the people and of the soldiers, both in the old regiments and in the new levies, to the present government increases still; that several people are daily taken up; that, in a word, nothing but your Majesty's presence is wanting to decide the whole in your favour.

I find Ralph (Berwick) builds extremely on the authority of those letters, and appears more than ever earnest for your Majesty's speedy departure. Who the writer is I know not, but he has a good deal more of zeal and warm imagination than of judgment or knowledge of England. He makes several childish mistakes in the detail which he gives.

The enclosed paper is an extract of a letter from M. d'Iberville, and is an answer to the first memorial, of which your Majesty had a copy some time ago, wherein our English friends were told how unable you was to provide what they expected, and were desired to answer categorically, whether, in such circumstances, you should make your enterprise or not.

You will observe that they suspend giving this answer till they see the effect of the King of France's death; that is, till they see whether Humphrey (the Regent) will be Whig or Tory. By this time they must know, from common report, that he takes the former *pli*, and from the second memorial, perhaps, likewise; since, although Monsieur de Torcy returned me that which I had delivered, that it might go in his packet, yet I hope the duplicate forwarded by the way of Holland has reached London. I make no farther reflections on this head; but I think it is no hard matter to guess beforehand what the

answer from England will be, whenever it is given. That it may be given as soon as possible, I have despatched Hamilton, the clergyman, to England, with full information, and with positive assurances of your resolution; so that they must either determine to act immediately, or to stop your Majesty. The first answers your end, the latter clears your conduct; both deliver us from the worst of states, that of suspense.

Hamilton is directed to lose no time in hastening back; and I hope we have taken such measures, that his journey will be unsuspected and prosperous.

You will please, Sir, to observe, farther, that the commission sent to Scotland will not tally to the present circumstances, if advices from thence are true, and I believe they are so, which say that Mar is at the head of all your friends, that Athol declined joining them himself, and used his utmost endeavours to stop his son Tullibardine, who had too much honour to be influenced by him. I should be, therefore, humbly of opinion that, instead of a duplicate of that commission, your Majesty should please to let me have one with blanks, both for the Commander-in-chief, and for the adjuncts to him, and I will find a way of sending it to Scotland.

I have yet no answer from St. Malo's nor Brest; but I dare say the instructions are so well concerted, that this service will be performed to your satisfaction.

I have sent orders to R. Arbuthnot to despatch the vessel fitted at Havre for your Majesty to Port Passage, the place to which it is proposed that the Spanish money should be sent, and the properest place on that coast for you to embark at, should you resolve to go by Spain.

Ralph (Berwick) hopes, or seems to hope, that this money will be procured. I continue an infidel.

We shall do our best to station another ship at the mouth of the Texel; and Charles (Ormond) assures me (for of that matter I know nothing) that another will be ready at Dunkirk.

The little ship with arms shall, according to your Majesty's orders, be kept for England if possible.

I had wrote thus far, when Charles showed me a letter, the original of which you will receive with this.

By that the affair in England presses as well as in Scotland. I am to see the Marshal d'Huxelles to-morrow, as well as M. d'Effiat. I do verily think that they begin to stagger on their Whiggish ground. I pray God I may be able to bring them up at last to give fair play, and a reasonable connivance; and I hope to see the time when I shall be able to speak to this Court, in your Majesty's name, in another style than I am forced, much against the grain, to speak at present.

I will omit nothing which it is possible for man to do to get ready your ships; and, provided the secret be kept, I hope we shall set you safe on your own land. There is somewhat odd in the passage of the *Lardon* you were pleased to send me. I remember the same thing happen before your sister sent her army, in 1704, into Germany. But I must still say that, since I have been in business, I never observed so little secret as there has been in your Majesty's affairs: for instance, a gentleman belonging to Stair named the very number of battalions which we expected from Sweden; and the Marquis d'Effiat told me the very sum which Marlborough has advanced to you.

If I spoke of Dumbarton as the place at which your Majesty should land, I mistook grossly; I mean somewhere to the northward of it, on the north-west coast; for to the other coast, which is much nearer your friends, I doubt you cannot think of going.

Charles gives an account of himself, so that I need say nothing on that head, but conclude for the present, since to-morrow or next day at furthest, I shall probably be obliged to renew this trouble to your Majesty.

From your Majesty's faithful and dutiful,

B.

---

JAMES TO LORD BOLINGBROKE.

(*Extract.*)

Oct. 10. 1715.

RALPH (D. of Berwick) is so incommunicable and in-



comprehensible, that I have directed D. O(rmond) to say nothing to him of the present resolutions. Ralph is now a cypher, and can do me no harm ; and if he withdraws his duty from me, I may well my confidence from him.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Paris, Oct. 18. 1715.*

THE more I think of it, the more I am convinced that it is absolutely necessary that the Duke of Ormond should, on his arrival in England, instantly disperse some popular paper among the people ; and that declarations and letters should be ready to fly about to all parts, on the very moment of time when your Majesty is arrived, or is upon your arrival. This is not my private sense alone, but the joint opinion of the Duke, and of every man here who knows any thing of the present state of that country.

What the methods of carrying on business formerly might be, I am ignorant ; but of late years, those have done it best who have, by frequent and plausible appeals to the people, gained the nation to their side. Since the decay of the monarchy, and the great rise of the popular power without, since the Whig schemes took place, we have been forced to combat them at their own weapon. By these means we brought the bulk of England from a fondness of war to be in love with peace : by the same means have they been brought from an indolent desponding submission to Hanover, to rouse and exert themselves in your cause. The same methods must be pursued, and the same topics must be insisted upon, or the spirit will die away, and your Majesty will lose that popularity which is (allow me to use the expression) the only expedient that can bring about your restoration. I know what may be said, and what, perhaps, is said, that the nation is engaged, and so many considerable men are dipped, that popularity is the less to be regarded. But I beseech your Majesty to take the word of a faithful ser-

vant, and to judge of me and others as you find this to be true or false: if the present ferment is not kept up, if the present hopes and fears are not cultivated by an industrious application of the same honest art by which they were created, you will find the general zeal grow cool, and a new set of compounders arise.

---

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*(Extract.)**Paris, Oct. 20. 1715.*

I AM really hopeful that I shall retrieve the loss we sustained by the King's death, and by the first untoward demonstration of the Regency against your Majesty's interest, at least so far as to have the French coast to a certain degree open to us; whereas, according to the track things were going in, the ports of France would have been as much closed to us as those of Holland.

This is what may at present be expected; and more than this will not be obtained by any other motive than success at home.

---

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*(Extract.)**Paris, Oct. 24. 1715.*

I AM not very well edified by the last advices of the 4th and 6th from England; and one particular, I confess, quite distracts my thoughts. The story is told several ways, and many groundless circumstances are, I believe, added; but, in general, I doubt it is true that Sir William Wyndham has surrendered himself, and has been set at liberty, some affirm on bail, others on his parole. I know the virtue of the man so well, that I have not the least distrust of him; but I confess to you Sir, my apprehension is, that, after his escape, he tried the West, and found them not disposed to rise; in which case he

had perhaps nothing left to do, but by his father-in-law's credit to save himself as well as he could. He and Lansdown are the only two men I know, and I think I know them all, capable to take the lead in those counties; so that I am much perplexed what fruit we may reap from Campion's and Courteney's journey, and even from the Duke of Ormond's expedition. One use, I am persuaded, must be made of this alteration of circumstances, or, allow me to say, your Majesty will act rashly. You must take your measures with more precaution, and proceed more leisurely . . . . . I return to my first principles; there is no tolerable degree of safety for you to be expected, without an entire secret as to your going. Nothing shall be neglected to keep all quiet here, and to put the inquisitive on a false scent. I have made many a false confidence of late concerning your designs even to the greatest.

---

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*(Extract.)**Paris, Nov. 2. 1715.*

I AM very happy that your Majesty is pleased to approve of the frankness with which I have exposed to you several disagreeable truths.

The state of England is so much altered from what it was some years ago, and the notions in which men have been educated are so different, that those motives which would have been sufficient formerly will not be so now; and those reserves which formerly would have caused no umbrage, may now prove fatal. Whenever your Majesty sets your foot upon English ground, you will find all this to be true, even in a greater degree than I have represented it to you.

The letters are printing, and the Declaration too. The former may properly enough be countersigned, but the latter ought not to be so. Besides the form, I own to your Majesty that the alterations made in the draught are strong objections with me against putting my name to it. No name whatever will hinder men, whose jea-

lonsies on that head run very high, from observing that there is no promise made in favour of the Church of Ireland, and that even the promise which relates to the Church of England is very ambiguous, and liable to more than one interpretation.

In this case my name will do your Majesty's cause no service, and my credit will suffer by it. But if, in the first heat of things, these omissions should not be regarded, nor other expressions which, to avoid being tedious, I omit, be observed, yet hereafter they will be taken notice of; and it is easy to foresee that, in all disputes which may arise about settling the Government upon your restoration, the Declarations you shall have published will be the text to which all parties will resort. In this case, Sir, I should not be able to answer it to the world, or to my own conscience, if my name had in any degree contributed to weaken that security which all your friends expect, and will certainly insist upon, both for the Church of England and for that of Ireland. I serve your Majesty with an entire zeal, and upon that bottom which can alone restore you and the monarchy. Was I to go off from that bottom, which I am incapable of, I should become useless to you.

The Duke of Ormond's going off has made Stair redouble his diligence, and his spies are upon every road near this city. I have done my utmost to give him impressions that may mislead him about your Majesty, and, I hope, not without some success. As to myself, I continue to appear in all public places with as little air of business as possible; and I doubt it is of absolute necessity that I should do so till you are out of reach, and till I have given some form, at least, to the measures that must be taken to send officers after you, to improve and ripen the correspondence with this Court, which mends every day, and to secure the sending money, arms, and ammunition, without which neither England nor Scotland can support your cause; for, Sir, your Majesty must not expect a revolution now — you must depend upon a war. I have nothing in view but where and how I can be most useful, and the moment I cease to be so in one place, I remove to another. But, indeed, at present, I should not be able to stir, was the call upon me ever so

urgent. I have, since my return from Bar, had a dis-temper come upon me, of which I never felt the least symptom in my life before, and am hardly able to bear the motion of a coach in these streets. They tell me that I shall soon be free from it.

I am in concern not to have heard from the Duke of Ormond as I expected. I am told he embarked on Monday.

Your resolution not to embark for England till you hear from thence is a great satisfaction to me; any other measure would have been destruction. As to your proceeding to Scotland, I am really unable to speak for or against it, being perfectly ignorant of the coast and of the navigation. But if your Majesty cannot go to England, I take it the Duke of Ormond will be forced to come back, and he will certainly come back to the place where you wait, and that will be the time of determining finally.

---

LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

(*Extract.*)

*Paris, Nov. 8. 1715.*

STAIR did not know in many days of your Majesty's departure, neither can I yet say that he knows certainly the route which you have taken; but the length of the journey, and the delay which you may be obliged to make on the coast, will probably give him time to find you out.

He has already complained that you are removed from Bar, and has asked to have the coast visited. The Marshal d'Huxelles sent to me immediately; and the orders are so given, that your ships will be overlooked. Should he be able to point out the vessel to them, or to say positively where you are, I doubt the Regent would think himself obliged to stop both.

I should be still more uneasy under this difficulty, could there probably be occasion of suspending much longer the final resolution which you will find it proper



to take. But I imagine that your Majesty must have heard from England, and be apprised of the movements which the last message sent over shall have produced, before Mr. Ruth or Mr. Sheldon can possibly join you.

If, notwithstanding all the disappointments which our friends in the West have met with, and particularly the villany of Maclean, of whose treachery your Majesty cannot fail to have had an account, the Duke of Ormond lands, and is able to make a head, your Majesty, I conclude, will pass immediately over to such place as the advices from those parts shall direct; and, in this case, I must be humbly of opinion, that you should pass, although the rising were in no degree so considerable as, when you resolved to go, you expected it would be. You are on the coast; the people will be in expectation of you; your reputation will increase by such a step; perhaps your interest will be promoted by it: at worst, it is better to make a bold experiment so near to your retreat as the West of England, than to abandon yourself to the Highlands of Scotland, at a season when your navigation thither is very uncertain, and in a conjuncture when I apprehend that little progress can be expected; for these two propositions seem to me to be self-evident,—that England will not rise upon your marching into the North from Scotland, if she will not rise upon your coming, or offering to come, into the West; and, in the next place, that the utmost efforts of Scotland, if England cannot or will not rise, must end in a composition. However, I must submit part of this opinion to the judgment of the seamen, as I do the whole, with great respect, to your Majesty.

Since I wrote thus far, the Duke of Berwick has been with me; he just came from the Regent, who has sent a detachment to stop your Majesty at Château Thierry, where Stair has received information that you are. The Duke presses extremely your going to Scotland, even preferably to England. I confess I cannot feel the force of that reasoning.

---

## LORD BOLINGBROKE TO JAMES.

*(Extract.)**Paris, Nov. 9. 1715.*

YOUR Majesty will receive this packet, which contains all the Duke of Mar's despatches, by Col. Hay, who was sent with Dr. Abercrombie from Scotland, and arrived here last night.

I think these accounts, and what these gentlemen say by word of mouth, open a new scene, and suggest new thoughts.

Should your Majesty not be gone for England, and should this letter come in time to your hands, I believe you will be of opinion that nothing but the impracticability of the navigation ought to hinder you from going to the North-west of Scotland. . . . . I writ last night to the Marshal d'Huxelles, and shall, I believe, see him by and by. They fluctuate strangely in all their measures; their inclinations are with us, their fears work for the Whigs. A little good success would determine them the right way. The project of the arms goes on, and I have opened a new door of access to the Regent. He has still the marriage in his head, and a little good fortune would make the bait succeed to draw him in.

---

## JAMES TO LORD BOLINGBROKE.

*Peterhead, Dec. 22. 1715.*

I AM at last, thank God, in my own ancient kingdom, as the bearer will tell you, with all the particulars of my passage, and his own proposals of future service. Send the Queen the news I have got, and give a line to the Regent, *en attendant* that I send you from the army a letter from our friends, to whom I am going to-morrow. I find things in a prosperous way; I hope all will go well, if friends on your side do their part as I shall have done mine. My compliments to Magni; tell him the good news. I don't write to him, for I am wearied, and won't delay a moment the bearer.

J. R.

## JAMES TO LORD BOLINGBROKE.

*Kinnaird, Jan. 2. 1716.*

You will be surprised doubtlessly that the bearer of this proves to be one of our only two experienced officers; but there was an absolute necessity of sending him out of the country, on account of the disgust the Highlanders have got of him, which is altogether inexplicable. The man is certainly brave and honest, but had the misfortune to be at the head of the wing that ran away at the battle; and though, by what I can find, he was not faulty, yet there is such an odium against him as cannot be wiped off; so that, to draw him handsomely from among them, who cannot any more bear with him, I resolved to send him to the King of Spain, and in his way to you, to inform you of all, and receive your farther lights, before he pursues his longer journey, with which I find him very well pleased. His character in the army will make him have more credit than another; and he being to follow your directions at Paris, and his acquaintance with Cauliss in Spain, will in some measure supply his not speaking well the language.

The D. Mar sends you a journal of all transactions here, which will very much shorten this letter, and which will show you better than I can our present circumstances, which, to speak plain, are none of the best. All was in confusion before my arrival; terms of accommodation pretty openly talked of, the Highlanders returned home and but four thousand men left at Perth; and had I retarded some days longer, I might in all probability have had a message not to come at all. My presence indeed has had, and will have, I hope, good effects; the affection of the people is beyond expression, and my orders to the Highlands to come to the army will certainly be obeyed. Lord Breadalbane will, I have reason to believe, have no more resources; and D. Athol at last declare for me; and Lords Huntly and Seaforth soon dissipate the rebels in the north; but of all this I have no certainty, having not yet had returns to my letters to them, but suppose the best. We are too happy, if we can maintain Perth this winter: that is a point of the last

consequence, and what I hope the season of the year may render practicable, by taking from the enemy all possibility of an attempt against it, at least in such a manner as to oblige us to quit it, which we certainly shall not do without blows. But after all, if we are not increased before spring, it is impossible we can meet the advantages the enemies have over us in all particulars; it must make us unable to stand against them, and the greatest zeal and affection will cool at last, when all prospect of success is vanished. These are our circumstances, and such as I hope will move the Regent, who can alone, but that with ease, sway the balance on our side, and make our game sure. What is absolutely necessary for us, and that without loss of time, is a competent number of arms, with all that belongs to them; our five Irish regiments, with all the officers of the D. Berwick at their head; for whom and to whom I wish he may now be my General, but he shall never be my Minister. His presence here would really work miracles, for they know nothing but good of him; and to please them here, I am forced to say he is coming, for the contrary belief would be of the worst consequence. Less than all this will not do our work, but this I hope will effectually. The letter you desired for the Regent goes with this, with a private note from D. Mar, in which alone, by my direction, is noticed the kind reception of the former one. Now, as to the D. of Ormond, can he not get into England or Ireland? I am clearly for his coming to join me here; though, could the Regent send him with troops into England at the same time that our Irish regiments come here, it would end the dispute very soon; and indeed, without a diversion in England, what I have asked for this country may keep up the cause, but will not I fear alone decide it. This, therefore, of the D. Ormond, must be much insisted on, as a point of the last importance. I should have mentioned before, that Roche or Dillon I must have. One I can spare you, but not both; and, may be, Dillon would be useful in Ireland, and more useful than another to D. Ormond, who must not be neither without one of them. Should the Duke of Berwick remain obstinate, this last point will be of absolute necessity, and the Duke of Mar thinks that it will

be more for my service that in that case one of them take the command of the army upon him, which he says his countrymen will not dislike, for he is himself very weary of that burden; and, indeed, I do not wonder at it; but he must and will continue till another comes, and I must do him the justice to say that I never met with a more able nor more reasonable man, nor more truly disinterested and affectionate to me; and it is wonderful how he has managed matters here, and with what dexterity he has, till now, managed all parties, and kept life in so many sinking spirits. In relation to Spain my letter is general, and my instructions to Mr. Hamilton the same. I have referred him to receive the Queen's directions as to the details of his conduct, which must be squared according as your negotiation goes on in France, and as the troops I ask from Spain may be speedily got, for that is the point; a speedy succour will gain all, and without it all is lost. You will neglect nothing, I am sure, on your side, and use the most urgent arguments in the pleading of my cause where you now are.

I here send you some letters to forward which I thought it not improper to write, and would have wrote similar letters, as I did before I set sail, but that I have neither papers, nor indeed any thing here but myself, so the ceremonial is impracticable. The superscription to the Emperor I know not, so it must be put with you; to the States I could not write, till I knew how they received my last letter; but those I now write are, I think, the most material, and the only necessary. By D. Mar's advice I have writ the two enclosed to D. Argyle and his brother; pray God they have good effect. You will, I believe, wonder I am not yet at the army, but there are yet so few men at Perth, that should the enemy advance before the Highlanders come down, we could not maintain that post, so that it was not thought advisable for me to expose myself to a retreat on my first joining the army; but as the accounts now, and the season of the year make us hope that they will not advance that way, although the Dutch troops have joined, and that I reckon the Highlanders will soon come, I am to be there some time this week. In the meantime, since my landing I have been advancing fair and easy from one town to



another, first to Fetteresso, where I waited for D. Mar, to whom I despatched Cameron from thence, and who approved extremely my waiting for him there. He arrived down the 27th, I left it the 30th. I came to Lady Panmure's house at Brechin, and am this day at Lord Southesk's. I have at present no more to add, but shall keep my letter open till I am ready to despatch Mr. Hamilton, who is gone to Perth for his things, and who will meet me on Monday at Glamis. Poor Booth I am in pain for, for we passed Dunkirk together, and I heard no more of him after the next day, that his ship lagged behind mine. You will, I believe, have been weary to have been so long without hearing from me; but for some days after my arrival I had nothing new, nor positive, nor material to say, and even by this occasion know not whether I shall be able to send you a positive account of what motions the enemy may make; but if they stir not in a fortnight, it is not likely they will of the whole winter. D. Mar very prudently would let nobody stir from the army but a few he brought with him, so I have seen none of them yet, nor taken any resolution. As to state affairs, the war is now the point, and the more solely we attach ourselves to that the better; when that is over will be a proper time for other matters. In the meantime my business is to please as many and disgust as few as possible; so that I shall give good words to all, but dispose of neither place nor any other thing yet, more than is absolutely necessary. I have made Earl Marshal gentleman of my bedchamber, Cameron groom, and J. Hay equerry, and there I stop.

I send to the Queen all the letters I mention here, that she may peruse them, and then agree with you the best ways of forwarding them; you will show her this, for mine to her refers to it. I have made D. Mar write to D. Berwick, that nothing may be neglected to get him, which is of the last importance, and you cannot insist on it too much with the Regent. Could there not be ways found to raise money on particular people at Paris? you know how well inclined to me the French are in general, and I am persuaded they will show it on this occasion.

*Glamis, 4th.* — Lady Murray has received my packet; our people are not yet come all up, but I shall still be at

Scoon after to-morrow, to stay there till my house is ready at Perth. There are reports of a rising in Ireland; pray God it be true; and it is said Lord Sutherland hath abandoned Inverness; but sooner or later I make no great doubt of its coming to that. There will go by the next messenger a duplicate of all this packet except my letter to the Queen, all that is material being in this letter.

D. Mar writes to Mr. Straiton to lose no opportunity of writing into France by the post, that you may at least know that we are alive, when we cannot send details by express. The snow keeps me from this. — 5th. So to gain time I shall make up my packet here, and add in another letter what may occur before G. Hamilton parts. I shall leave him at Dundee, where I reckon to be to-morrow.

J. R.

---

JAMES TO LORD BOLINGBROKE.

*Montrose, Feb. 3. 1716.*

THE Duke of Mar's letters and the bearer's relation will supply my not entering into any details. Sure the Regent will not abandon us all, or rather, will not be quite blind to his own interest. Nothing will be neglected, I am sure, on your side. You will know the whole truth, and then make the best use of it.

J. R.

## NOTES.

## WHIGS AND TORIES OF 1712 AND 1832.

"ON examination, it will be found that, in nearly all particulars, a modern Tory resembles a Whig of Queen Anne's reign, and a Tory of Queen Anne's reign a modern Whig."—(*History*, p. 7.)—Some instances of this curious counterchange may not, perhaps, be unwelcome to the reader.

First, as to the Tories. The Tories of Queen Anne's reign pursued a most unceasing opposition to a just and glorious war against France. They treated the great general of the age as their peculiar adversary. To our recent enemies, the French, their policy was supple and crouching. They had an indifference, or even an aversion, to our old allies the Dutch. They had a political leaning towards the Roman Catholics at home. They were supported by the Roman Catholics in their elections. They had a love of triennial Parliaments in preference to septennial. They attempted to abolish the protecting duties and restrictions of commerce. They wished to favour our trade with France at the expense of our trade with Portugal. They were supported by a faction, whose war-cry was "Repeal of the Union," in a sister kingdom. To serve a temporary purpose in the House of Lords, they had recourse (for the first time in our annals) to a large and overwhelming creation of Peers. Like the Whigs in May, 1831, they chose the moment of the highest popular passion and excitement to dissolve the House of Commons, hoping to avail themselves of a short-lived cry for the purpose of permanent delusion.

The Whigs of Queen Anne's time, on the other hand, supported that splendid war which led to such victories as Ramillies and Blenheim. They had for a leader the great man who gained those victories. They advocated the old principles of trade. They prolonged the duration of Parliament. They took their stand on the principles of the Revolution of 1688. They raised the cry of "No Popery." They loudly inveighed against the subserviency to France—the desertion of our old allies—the outrage wrought upon the Peers—the deceptions practised upon the Sovereign—and the other measures of the Tory Administration.

Such were the Tories and such were the Whigs of Queen Anne. Can it be doubted that, at the accession of William the Fourth, Harley and St. John would have been called Whigs—Somers and Stanhope Tories? Would not the October Club have loudly cheered the measures of Lord Grey, and the Kit-Cat have found itself renewed in the Carlton? (1836.)

On the preceding passage a reviewer has truly observed:—"There is another remarkable coincidence between the position of the Tories in 1713 and the Whigs in 1836. It is that, in both, there is the same union with another party, (namely, the Jacobite in 1713, and the Radical in 1836,) that party acting for the time subordinately to them, and suffering them to take the lead, yet preserving a distinct character, possessing a powerful influence in the country, and intent upon carrying out their objects to a much greater extent."—(*Quarterly Review*, No. cxiv. p. 335.)

---

#### OLD AND NEW STYLES.

In closing this Appendix I shall take the opportunity of quoting an observation already made in my *War of the Succession*.

"Since the Old Style was at this period the legal one of England, while the other was adopted in nearly all the Continental states, the difference requires constant

“ attention in historians, and is very apt to mislead them.  
“ A fleet, for instance, is said to sail from Portsmouth on  
“ a particular day, and to anchor at Lisbon on another;  
“ and a writer who does not observe that the former is  
“ an English, and the latter a Portuguese date, will in  
“ his computation lengthen the voyage by eleven days.”

No scheme which an historian can form for his own guidance upon this subject is wholly free from inconvenience and perplexity. The rule to which I have adhered is, that when neither the Old nor the New Style is expressly specified in my narrative, the transactions in England are to be understood as given according to the former, and the transactions upon the Continent according to the latter.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

















## LIBRARY OF DAVIDSON COLLEGE

Books on regular loan may be checked out for **two weeks**. Books must be presented at the Circulation Desk in order to be renewed.

A fine is charged after date due.

Special books are subject to special regulations at the discretion of library staff.

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

|                    |                 |        |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------|
| Stanhope           |                 | 942.07 |
| AUTHOR             |                 | S78h   |
| History of England |                 | v. 1   |
| TITLE              |                 |        |
| DATE DUE           | BORROWER'S NAME |        |
|                    |                 |        |
|                    |                 |        |

Stanhope

942.07

History of England

S78h

v. 1

